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Archbishop’s Presidential Address 2015

Members of Synod, brothers and sisters, saints of the Most High, welcome to the second session of the 50th Synod of the Diocese of Sydney.

As we gather together in the presence of God, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land upon which we meet. In his wisdom and love, our heavenly Father gave this estate to the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation. Upon this land they met for generations until the coming of British settlers. As we continue to learn to live together on these ancestral lands, we acknowledge and pay our respects to their elders, past and present, and pray that God will unite us all in a knowledge of his Son, in whom all things were created, in heaven and on earth, whether visible or invisible—for all things have been created through him and for him.

Mission 2020—New Churches for New Communities

Last year the Synod enthusiastically endorsed Mission 2020 with a vision to see Christ honoured as Lord and Saviour in every community. It was the result of much work both before and during Synod. Of course, if we thought that we laboured long and hard in getting the wording right, that is nothing compared to the work that lies ahead as

we commit ourselves afresh, in prayerful dependence on the Holy Spirit, to glorify God and love our neighbour by proclaiming the Lord Jesus Christ, calling people to repent and living lives worthy of him.

The Strategic Research Group (SRG) has been hard at work seeking ways to resource and encourage parishes in their local mission context and Bishop Peter Lin will provide an update of its work during this Synod. In particular, given that Mission 2020 has measurable goals aligned to the NCLS statistics, the SRG has developed in conjunction with NCLS the M20, a shortened form of the NCLS survey which parishes can use each year to assess their progress against their own particular goals aligned to the priorities of Mission 2020. As all rectors have been informed last week, the M20 survey is now available for use at a modest cost to parishes. With the five yearly National Church Life Survey being undertaken in 2016, I encourage all parishes to consider using the M20 survey this year, and again in 2017 and beyond, so that you can track your missional effectiveness with objective data. It will be a significant aid in directing and informing your missional efforts, though of course, the choice is yours.

Next year Greater Sydney’s population will pass the 5 million mark. The Bureau of Statistics’ latest population figures indicate the Cobbitty-Leppington area in south-western Sydney is the fastest growing area followed by Parklea-Kellyville Ridge. In fifteen years it is expected an additional one million people will live within the greater metropolitan area of Sydney, with a total population of 5.9 million. Whether by birth or migration these new arrivals will be part of our mission field.

Of course, Sydney has been a growing city for many years. In 1836 Bishop Broughton established the Diocesan Committee for Church Growth to address the need of the mid-nineteenth century. Twenty years later Bishop Barker formed the Church Society (to become Sydney’s Home Mission Society under Archbishop Wright, which we now know as Anglicare). After the Second World War, Archbishop Mowll established ‘More Churches for Greater Sydney Campaign’. In 1964 Archbishop Gough oversaw the formation of the New Areas Committee. Twenty years later Archbishop Robinson created ‘Vision for Growth’, which raised $7m over six years. Archbishop Goodhew followed this enterprise with ‘Vision 2001’ and Archbishop Jensen was instrumental in the expenditure of $20million from the Diocesan Endowment for facilitating church growth by not only providing grants to selected parishes to increase the capacity of their buildings, but also purchasing land and erecting new church buildings in Greenfield sites.

Yet Greater Sydney continues to grow. Therefore we must continue to grow. Before this Synod lies the challenge to continue funding the acquisition of land in the growth corridors of Sydney, which the Synod initially endorsed three years ago. This is a generous commitment of our parishes to look beyond themselves and to plan for the future. Yet the Greenfield levy will only secure the land. It was for this reason that last year I announced my intention to form a new body to raise the necessary funds to build New Churches for New Communities. I am pleased to say that I have gathered a committee of capable and experienced Anglicans, under the chairmanship of Mr Philip Bell OAM to lead this work. I have also appointed the Rev. Glenn Gardner AM to be the Executive Director and in August this year we launched NCNC. It has been deliberately established as a separate entity so as not to become a drain upon already stretched diocesan finances. A number of significant donations have already been received from generous donors for which I thank God. Our goal is to raise $2.5million by 30 June 2016 as part of an overall target
of $20 million over the next five years. This is a daunting aspiration, but I see the results of this fundraising endeavour providing rich resources for the future growth of the kingdom of God. This requires our full commitment. Some of the funding for these facilities attracts tax-deductibility. The intention is to build new churches, gatherings of God’s people who will reach out with the life-giving gospel to the new communities that are springing up in the growth corridors of the north west and south west areas of Sydney.

In the spirit of Mission 2020, I am delighted to report that other diocesan organisations are looking at ways in which they can constructively engage with NCNC in providing Anglican resources for these communities. Already Anglicare, Anglican Retirement Villages, Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation and, of course, the Mission Property Committee have expressed their desire to work collaboratively with this venture.

Some of the proposed church plants, like Stanhope, already exist, but experience shows that they will need facilities of their own for significant church growth to be achieved. In close cooperation with the Mission Property Committee, plans are well advanced to commence construction of church facilities at Stanhope Gardens in October 2016. Land has also been secured at Leppington, Marsden Park, Riverstone and Austral, upon all of which it is hoped that in association with MPC, NCNC will be able to build so that God’s church might bring the gospel of Christ to the new communities arriving at their doorstep. Synod will hear more of these developments when MPC and NCNC report later during this session.

However, it needs to be recognised that Sydney is not only growing at the edges of its historic boundaries. Much of the growth is in the inner city and rejuvenated existing suburbs as high-rises dominate the landscape previously reserved for suburban bungalows. Last year the new developments in the Waterloo-Beaconsfield area of the inner south experienced the second largest population growth in Sydney with a population increase of 2000. The work of Evangelism and New Churches has a significant part to play in the planting of new churches and they have responsibility for two separate church plants in Green Square, in addition to the parish of South Sydney’s own church plant at St James’ Beaconsfield. The Reverend Philip Wheeler has been appointed as the new Director of ENC from 2016, after the retirement of the Reverend Bruce Hall to whom we are in debt for his contribution to our diocese in the work of both cross-cultural evangelism as well as church planting. I look forward to the contribution that Phil Wheeler will make to ENC as an integral part of Mission 2020.

Bishop of South Sydney
The work in Green Square has also developed under the watchful eye of the Right Reverend Robert Forsyth, who has held the position of Bishop of South Sydney since the year 2000, and at his retirement in December this year he will have been the longest serving bishop of any region. Robert has been a member of this Synod since 1983, a member of our Standing Committee since 1990 (currently its longest serving clerical member), a Sydney representative on the General Synod for twenty-five years and a member of the General Synod Standing Committee since 1998 and of its Executive since 2004. Robert has served our diocese well in a number of capacities since his ordination some forty years ago. He has not always won his battles on the floor of Synod, but he has always been an engaging and respected member of this chamber when he does speak. I particularly would like to pay tribute to his humility and grace following the Election Synod of 2001. Our diocese has some unfortunate history of relational difficulties around elections. Yet Robert distinguished himself under Archbishop Peter Jensen with loyalty and warmth, without rancour. An example to be followed by many who do not gain a position to which they might aspire—whatever their field of endeavour.

I am pleased that the Reverend Doctor Michael Stead has accepted my appointment to be Robert’s successor as Bishop of South Sydney. Michael will be able to build on the good work that Robert has undertaken in the region and I have every confidence that Michael will be make a significant contribution to the life of the Diocese as whole in his new role.

‘Same-Sex Marriage’
We live in a world of social change. This is not a new observation, yet it brings fresh challenges for gospel proclamation in our society, which appears to be moving further and further away from the guidelines for living which are enshrined in God’s Word. As Christians, we are at odds with the world. For good reason, John the Evangelist recorded Jesus’ warning to his disciples:

If the world hates you, know that it has hated me before it hated you. If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hates you.

John 15:18-19
Two things are identified by Jesus. Notice the world hated him first. To be a disciple of Jesus is to follow in his footsteps. This is not to suggest that we are to look for opposition, let alone persecution, but if we are true to our Master, faithful to his commission, then opposition and persecution will inevitably follow, as Paul reminded Timothy (2 Timothy 3:12). The second fact that Jesus mentions is that he chose us. It is his choice, not ours; it is for his glory, not ours. It therefore follows that we undergo opposition for his sake, not ours. Moreover, he who chose us is truly with us. His Spirit indwells us so that we may live for his glory and endure the persecution that may come our way. In the same chapter of John’s Gospel, Jesus told his disciples that he had spoken these words so that his joy might be in them—in us—and that our joy may be full (John 15:11). This is an incredible promise and one that perhaps we do not appreciate, let alone assimilate, in our daily lives.

How is your joy? Is it real or feigned in the face of opposition to the gospel from your friends or family, workmates or fellow travellers? For joy is a fruit of the Spirit, listed second after love. Yes, even joy, in the midst of suffering, according to the apostle James.

> Count it all joy, my brothers and sisters, when you meet various trials, for you know that the testing of your faith produces steadfastness. And let steadfastness have its full effect, that you may be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing.

James 1:2-4

While suffering in the name of Christ can be hard, it is also the fount of joy. It enabled Jesus to sing a hymn before he went to Gethsemane (Matthew 26:30) and Paul to sing hymns to God while in prison (Acts 16:25). It enables us to sing with the psalmist:

> May those who sow in tears reap with shouts of joy!
> Those that go forth weeping, bearing the seed for sowing,
> shall come home with shouts of joy, bringing their sheaves with them.

Psalm 126:5-6

The antagonism of the world to the Word of God is perhaps seen nowhere more acutely than in the virulent challenge to the definition of marriage which pervades conversations in the media, the workplace and even in our places of leisure. The bombardment, both subtle and not so subtle, is relentless. Those, like us, who hold dearly to the definition of marriage as enunciated in the Book of Common Prayer, are under attack for defending holy matrimony as an honourable estate, instituted of God in the time of man’s innocence…and is commended of Saint Paul to be honourable among all men: and therefore is not by any to be enterprized, nor taken in hand, unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly, to satisfy men’s carnal lusts and appetites, like brute beasts that have no understanding; but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God; duly considering the causes for which Matrimony was ordained.

The opening exhortation from the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony outlines three reasons for which the holy estate of matrimony was ordained. First, for the procreation of children; second, as a remedy against sin; and third for the mutual society, help and comfort that the one ought to have for the other.

Marriage is fundamentally not a social construct of human invention, but is a divinely ordained institution for the good of humanity and the well being of society. Yet our society for many years has not recognised the importance of this divine origin, nor of the importance of confining sexual intercourse to the marriage of a man and woman, united by an exclusive and permanent bond, ‘forsaking all others’, ‘so long as they both shall live’.

Sexual activity outside of marriage became more prevalent following the sexual revolution of the 1960s. In the following decades we have witnessed the increase of couples living together without any commitment to marry, the erosion of trust between married couples where the dissolution of marriage has become more accessible through ‘no fault’ divorce, the celebration of homosexual acts, and the attempt to normalise sexual activity between two men or between two women. Yet despite the statistically small number of ‘committed partnerships’ within the gay community, let alone their representing merely 1% of all couples in Australia in 2011, it was only a matter of time before the arguments in favour of ‘same-sex marriage’ would enter the public debate. It is hard to believe that a mere eleven years ago, with bipartisan support, the Marriage Act was strengthened by the explicit clarification that ‘marriage means the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life.’
Yet what was accepted and endorsed by the major parties a little more than a decade ago has now become anathema to the majority of the Labor Party and to several influential members of the Liberal Party. It would also appear that an Anglican Bishop in our country believes it is inevitable, and has even opined that it could be compatible with the teaching of our Church! Opinion polls, questionable though they may be, tell us that a majority of Australians believe that marriage needs to become inclusive of both genders—let alone those who claim no specific gender. ‘Marriage equality’ is their mantra. Yet despite the success of this slogan it claims more than it can achieve. There simply is no ‘marriage equality’ for everyone. Marriage necessarily has boundaries that even the adherents of the facile rhetoric of ‘marriage equality’ cannot deny: children, for example, are excluded; couples within prohibited relationships, such as siblings, are excluded; those who are already married and wish to marry another spouse are also excluded. Yet we are the ones portrayed as being discriminatory in our defence of marriage, when in fact we are not alone, for everyone needs to discern the purpose of marriage if one is to understand, and so rightly ‘discriminate’, regarding the eligibility of proper candidates for marriage.

It is for this reason that I applauded the decision of the Abbott Government, reaffirmed by Malcom Turnbull since becoming Prime Minister, to hold a plebiscite upon the question of marriage. I, like many others, had encouraged the Prime Minister to choose this path, for the nature of marriage is of such fundamental significance to the way in which we as a society operate, that such a question should be put to the people of Australia by way of a national vote, rather than be left in the hands of 200 parliamentarians in Canberra, many of whose views are as variable as the latest opinion polls in their electorates. However, a national plebiscite allows the people to express their opinion and to do so in an informed manner. Like a referendum, the government funds both the Yes argument as well as the No argument to any question put to the Australian electorate. It is not difficult to discern the bias that media outlets, whether they be television, radio, digital or newsprint, exhibit when promoting a change in our law with scant attention to the argument for retaining what has been an understanding of marriage in Australia, not only for the past two centuries of white settlement, but for thousands of years of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures.

That two TV stations should recently refuse to air advertisements by Marriage Alliance for promoting what is simply the law of the land is a scandal! It is also symptomatic of the wave of naive enthusiasm for the novelty of ‘same-sex marriage’ that a significant number of corporations have published their endorsement for this change in our law. How, one might ask, does such a position have anything to do with the core business of these companies—it is inexplicable. Why don’t we hear from these companies about their views on the treatment of asylum seekers on Manus Island or the decline in Australia’s foreign aid budget or other controversial issues such as the slave trade, euthanasia or abortion? Have these companies any idea of how many shareholders, let alone employees, who do not share these publically endorsed sentiments regarding ‘same-sex marriage’? It is public knowledge that certain activist employees within these companies have lobbied their employers and board members to make a statement, so that they can be seen to be anti-discriminatory, even though to take such a stance has all the hallmarks of discrimination against those who wish the law to be maintained as it has been since the dawn of human civilisation.

I am therefore very grateful for the work of our Doctrine Commission in its publication earlier this year of their report Human Sexuality and the ‘Same Sex Marriage’ Debate. The report is worthy of wide circulation as it deals not only with the biblical and theological arguments from Scripture, but also engages with the contemporary debate, explores ways in which to put the case in the public arena, and most importantly, offers counsel as to how to minister to those who experience same-sex attraction. I trust that all rectors have drawn the attention of this resource to their congregations. It expresses the ‘No’ case admirably and identifies the weaknesses of the ‘Yes’ case. Above all, the Australian public needs to be informed of the argument against ‘same-sex marriage’ and not be beguiled by the empty rhetoric of ‘marriage equality’, without considering the impact upon severing the link between marriage and procreation, let alone severing the bond of the nurture of children by their biological parents on the premise of selfish adult preferences. It is time that all Christians, especially Anglicans, should enter the discussion and graciously and sensitively explain the reasons why our good Creator has made marriage the way he has. We need to be courageous in our discussions both in private and in public, yet we also need to be sensitive and loving in our defence of biblical truth. As Vaughan Roberts reminds us: ‘homosexuality is not simply an “issue”; it concerns people, created and loved by God, many of whom are Christians.’

Yes, it will kindle criticism, provoke ridicule, and invite hatred—but remember, you are not of the world, therefore, the world hates you. Yet such hatred should not silence us. Are we prepared to stand for what God has said, despite the opposition it will inevitably engender? There is no place, however, for a spirit of

---

superiority, let alone a spirit of contempt for those with whom we disagree. We must persuade with
gentleness (another fruit of the Spirit), sincerity and grace, as befits disciples of Christ.

Nonetheless, if the Australian electorate votes in favour of ‘same-sex marriage’ in a plebiscite, we as
citizens of the State will need to acknowledge this outcome, and learn to manage its consequences. This
will be a challenge for all Christians, as well as those of other faiths, whose theological commitment to
marriage as being heterosexual by definition will not change, despite such a change at law. We shall find
ourselves in very much the same situation as Christians in the first century, where Roman law was not as
broadly aligned to biblical values as it has been in Western civilisation for over a thousand years. This will
require wisdom, boldness and compassion. Of course, we should not forget that many Christians today live
under even more oppressive regimes than Ancient Rome.

Among our business papers are two motions: one, affirming the biblical definition of marriage, which in the
current climate needs to be re-affirmed; the other, addressing the wisdom of clergy retaining their marriage
licences should the Federal Government amend the Marriage Act to allow ‘same-sex marriages’. It is right
that both motions should come before us, so that our voice may be heard. However, we should not be blind
to other consequences of a change in the law. How will this affect our freedom of religion, or our ability to
teach the Bible’s view of marriage from the pulpit or in the classrooms of Anglican schools? The recent
complaint made to Tasmania’s Anti-Discrimination Commissioner about the Roman Catholic Church’s
booklet Don’t Mess with Marriage is a worrying development that represents a genuine threat to religious
freedom in our country. Therefore, our response as Christians to any change in the definition of marriage
will need prayerful and careful thought and a renewed dedication to defend ‘holy matrimony’ in light of the
possibility that the Federal Government may define ‘unholy matrimony’ by legislation.

Domestic Violence

If it were not enough that marriage was under threat by the advocates of ‘same-sex marriage’, the recent
heightened awareness of domestic violence within marriage is another wake-up call for our society. Two
years ago our Synod raised this question as a matter of concern. Since then, considerable work has been
done in addressing the issue, including Moore College and Ministry Training & Development in their
education of prospective and recently ordained ministers, though there is still more to be accomplished. I
am particularly grateful for Canon Sandy Grant’s having raised this matter on a number of occasions both
at Synod and Standing Committee and for his initiative in persuading Standing Committee to establish a
Task Force to develop a diocesan response to domestic violence. The Task Force has been asked to
consult with domestic violence victims or their representatives and report back with recommendations on
the following:

(a) developing, adopting and communicating a diocesan domestic violence policy statement,
along with advice for good pastoral practice;
(b) facilitating education of lay membership of our churches on the issue (e.g., via preparation of
suitable resources);
(c) educating our youth in regards to the recognition and prevention of domestic violence; and
(d) encouraging further developments in our education of clergy and church workers in this area
(e.g., recognising warning signs in marriage preparation).

While I welcome this Task Force, it grieves me that we need it. It is a salutary reminder of the corrosive
effects of sin even in the believer, that men who profess Christ should treat their wives with such contempt,
inflicting either verbal or physical abuse upon those whom they have promised ‘to love and to cherish, till
death us do part.’

This is not the way of Christ. It should not characterise the bride of Christ. It does not reflect, despite the
accusations of some, the inevitable consequences of the doctrine of headship in marriage. What it does
demonstrate, regrettably, is that in the words of the Thirty-nine Articles: ‘in the visible Church the evil be
ever mingled with the good’ (Article xxvi). If even Satan can use the words of Holy Scripture to tempt our
Lord, it is not difficult to concede that the Evil One can twist good doctrines to his own evil purposes. That
Christian women are caught in such a vulnerable situation at the hands of those who abuse their
responsibilities as husbands is both horrendous and inexcusable. It is therefore important that we address
this issue with honesty, compassion and resolve, so that we may protect those who suffer any form of
domestic abuse and find ways to prevent its reoccurrence, especially in the household of God.

Refugees from Syria and Iraq

While our mission is rightly focussed within the Diocese of Sydney, to some extent we are all global citizens.
The needs of the world radiate our screens, whether TV or IPads. I am therefore grateful for the work of
Anglican Aid and the Church Missionary Society who labour mostly outside Australia for the love of Christ in bringing relief both physical and spiritual to a needy world. As the apostle Paul sought to raise the sights of the Corinthians to the plight of the saints in Jerusalem, so we too must be prepared to give, and give generously, to alleviate the suffering that not only is within our reach, but beyond our shores. Again quoting the apostle, ‘as we have opportunity, let us do good to all people, especially the household of faith’ (Galatians 6:10).

Mission 2020 commits us to glorify God and love our neighbour—not only in word but also in deed.

The proclamation of Christ is central to the way in which we glorify God and love our neighbour, but unless we are living lives worthy of him, our proclamation will be ineffective and dishonouring to our God and Saviour. It was therefore with great joy when I witnessed the overwhelming response of our Diocesan family to the Syrian and Iraqi Refugee crisis that was catapulted onto our screens with the image of three-year old Aylan Kurdi, whose lifeless body was washed up on a Turkish beach in early September. The tens of thousands of refugees fleeing both Syria and Iraq suddenly attracted international attention, though the crisis had been looming for months. When the Government announced that Australia would take an additional 12,000 refugees from this conflict it provided an opportunity for us to offer a generous welcome to these displaced persons, many of whom are Christians.

Almost immediately Anglicare sprang into action and coordinated a response across both organisations and parishes of our Diocese. By the end of that week, I had been invited to a roundtable discussion with the Prime Minister in Canberra and in my hand were detailed plans of how the Diocese of Sydney could assist, with emergency accommodation, short term and medium term, food parcels, clothing, trauma counselling, English language lessons and special holiday camps for children. This was all possible because of the hard work of the staff of Anglicare and Youthworks, in particular, but the support offered by Moore College, Anglican Retirement Villages, Anglican Schools Corporation and Anglican Deaconess Ministries was also outstanding. To this was added the positive response of so many parishes, asking how they too might help. To date Anglicare has collected in excess of $200,000 in donations towards this special appeal within the space of a few weeks. This has been an extraordinary response and I thank all those who have acted so speedily and given so generously.

For ancient Israel it was not only the fellow Israelites to whom a duty of love belonged, but also the foreigners in their midst (Leviticus 19:33-34; Deuteronomy 10:18-19). Such treatment of resident aliens was unparalleled in the legal systems of the ancient world and was a direct consequence of God’s love for the stranger, and the fact that Israel were strangers in the land of Egypt. The teaching of the New Testament is no less compelling, as Jesus’ story of the Good Samaritan portrays.

In my opening address to Synod in 2013 I said:

Let our love for one another and our love for Christ, grounded in Christ’s love for us, be the magnet that draws unbelievers to the Saviour so they too may be enfolded into the fellowship of the church.

This past month has seen such love in abundance. We shall have further opportunity during this Synod to share ideas as to how else we might respond to the refugee crisis. I thank God for his love, and I thank God for his love shown through his people. And it is my prayer that we might be able to share God’s love with these people, in word as well as deed.

Both love and joy are fruit of the Spirit. May such fruit be the characteristic of all that we do in the name of Christ. May it especially characterise the conduct of our Synod as we seek to honour Christ as Lord and Saviour in every community—and especially in this chamber.

I commend you to God’s grace and the blessing of his Spirit.

Dr Glenn Davies
Archbishop of Sydney
12 October 2015
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Synod Service
The opening service on the first day of Synod was held in St Andrew’s Cathedral and led by Canon Christopher Allen, with Canon Stephen Gibson preaching.

Actions taken under the Parishes Ordinance 1979

The Synod assented to the following –

(a) reclassification of Liverpool South as a parish
(b) reclassification of Glenmore Park as a parish

Petitions
There were no petitions received by the Synod.
Questions under business rule 6.3

1. Support for churches in the Middle East

Mr Peter M G Young asked the following question –

Has the Diocese given any support or offered any support to the following churches (or other similar organisations) in Sydney since 1 January 2014 in refugee matters and, if so, in what (general as opposed to specific) manner –

(a) Holy Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church of the East,
(b) Syriac Orthodox Church,
(c) Greek Orthodox Church,
(d) Armenian Apostolic Church, or
(e) Armenian Church?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

No, not in Sydney.

Anglican Aid has distributed funds for Iraq to the Diocese of Egypt, the Foundation for Relief and Reconciliation in the Middle East (FRRME) and St George’s Anglican Church in Baghdad. These funds were then distributed through church networks. The Anglican Aid Annual Report will be provided to Synod members today. Page 10 of the Report states that FRRME distributed funds through the following churches in Iraq –

The Syrian Orthodox Church
MarShamot Church
The Armenian Church
The Carmelites
Al-Bishara Church

2. Grants from the Diocesan Endowment to brownfield churches in 2007

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

In respect of the $9.32m brownfields grants (made from the one-off $20m distribution in 2007 from the Diocesan Endowment) to the 9 parishes (excluding St Barnabas, Broadway) listed in the table at paragraph 10 of the paper “Ministry progress and brownfields’ grants”, page 166, Book 2 (Supplementary report of the Standing Committee) –

(a) What criteria were used by the relevant Committee at the time, which made these grants in 2007?

(b) Was there an open application process available to all parishes?

(c) How much of each grant to each parish was spent on –

(i) repairs, maintenance and general upgrade of matters such as lighting and sound systems; and/or
(ii) extensions of existing buildings; and/or
(iii) new land; and/or
(iv) new buildings?

(d) Was any consideration given by the granting committee, in respect of issues of repairs, maintenance and equipment upgrades referred to in point (c)(i) above, concerning the ongoing responsibility of church wardens relating to the care and maintenance of all church property and grounds?
(e) Was there a formal acquittal process required in respect of each of these grants and were these requirements met by each parish?

(f) What was the remaining $10.68m, from the total of the $20m one-off distribution, spent on?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Mission Property (Appropriation and Amendment) Ordinance 2007 (the “Ordinance”) established a mechanism by which the Mission Board, acting under delegated authority, was to determine the priorities for the application of the $20 million appropriated from the Diocesan Endowment and added to the capital of the Mission Property Fund.

The Mission Property Committee (“MPC”) was required to report to the Mission Board about progress in implementing projects (both greenfield acquisition, the development of land and brownfield construction and renovation of ministry buildings) identified in accordance with those priorities.

(a) Consistent with clause 5B of the Ordinance, the MPC considered the potential of a project to contribute to the objects of the Diocesan Mission was to be assessed primarily by its potential to contribute to an increase in the number of people attending church in the Diocese.

This was assessed by reference to a range of factors, some of which can be quantified and others of which are more subjective. Specific attention was given to –

(i) evidence of growth (using the Church Life Cycle model) – does attendance and offertory data indicate potential for growth in the parish?
(ii) the status of the existing buildings – does the condition or capacity of existing buildings inhibit ministry?
(iii) projected demographic growth – is the parish located in an area where there is expected to be substantial population growth?

(b) It was not an application process, the MPC drew on data from a number of sources including the New Capital Project (facility utilisation), project readiness (DA approval, regional Architectural Panel, etc), strategic demographic factors (Mission Property Strategy Report), and parish leadership (the Church Life Cycle model).

(c) The answer to this part of the question is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

(d) No grants were given for repairs, maintenance and equipment upgrades.

(e) Clause 5(4) of the Ordinance required the MPC to provide a detailed report to the Standing Committee about its progress in implementing projects. The MPC also appointed a project manager to oversee the completion of each project in accordance with the building contract.

(f) The answer to this part of the question is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

Attachment: (parts (c) and (f))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project total</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn St Thomas</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berowra</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>18,500,000</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions under business rule 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project total</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dapto</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>New building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmore Park</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoxton Park</td>
<td>5,280,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>New building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrickville</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naremburn/Cammeray</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooty Hill</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>New building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,060,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,320,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contingency 680,000

Oran Park (land) 2,200,000
Austral (land) 1,750,000
Stanhope Gardens (land) 3,630,000
Other 2,400,000

3. Secure online access to Synod documents

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

Noting the expressed desire from some members at previous Synods for easier access to Synod documents, including confidential ones, which are too voluminous to make freely available in printed form –

(a) Is there any consideration being given currently to the development of a secure area of the SDS website for Synod members?

(b) Have any major barriers been identified to such a development, and if so, what are they; and

(c) If so, what proposals are there, or might there be, to address these barriers?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

(a) SDS is currently considering how it can best provide secure information on its website to the members of the various boards and committees it serves. This includes Synod members.

(b) In relation to Synod, a major barrier is the projected level of administration required to facilitate individual logon credentials on the current website for about 770 Synod members.

(c) The most promising avenue to address this is as part of a possible new website, which is being actively considered.

4. Access to Audited Accounts and Annual Reports of Diocesan organisations

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

As a number of the Audited Accounts and Annual Reports of the 41 diocesan organisations, tabled in Synod are publicly available on the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC) website –
(a) could Synod please be provided with a list of those diocesan organisations and the website link to their reports; and

(b) noting this Diocese's Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations, Appendix 1, section D, part (d) which states –

“Members of the Synod must have reasonable access to the annual reports of diocesan organisations tabled at the Synod and must have an adequate opportunity to ask and have answered questions about the governance of diocesan organisations”,

could Synod in future receive this information, requested in part (a) of this question, prior to each Synod; and

(c) if not, why not?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

(a) The answer to this part of the question is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website. So far as we can ascertain it is not possible to provide a direct web link to the audited accounts on the ACNC Register because of the way the ACNC uploads this information to the Register. The table provides the ABN's for the organisations. These ABNs can easily be used to search the ACNC Register for the information at www.acnc.gov.au.

(b) Yes (though not direct web links to audited accounts for the reason stated). One possibility is that we indicate which organisations in the list have their audited accounts and reports available from the ACNC Register.

(c) Not applicable.

Attachment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School / Organisation</th>
<th>ABN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsleigh School Council</td>
<td>18 199 714 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPT – Community Building Partnership Fund</td>
<td>19 344 575 886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Retirement Villages #</td>
<td>39 922 848 563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Youthworks</td>
<td>96 398 231 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Aid (incorporating Archbishop’s Community Care and Development Program) #</td>
<td>28 525 237 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Aid – Overseas Ministry Fund #</td>
<td>94 609 182 072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Aid – Overseas Relief and Aid Fund #</td>
<td>59 792 865 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicare #</td>
<td>88 851 368 006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden Anglican School</td>
<td>22 851 187 489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker College Council</td>
<td>18 620 620 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbelltown Anglican Schools Council</td>
<td>65 653 218 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra Grammar School Council</td>
<td>88 023 426 543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings School Council</td>
<td>24 481 364 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macarthur Anglican School Council</td>
<td>58 390 019 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Theological College Council</td>
<td>47 746 452 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Catherine's School Council</td>
<td>98 012 260 068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation</td>
<td>63 544 529 806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions under business rule 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School / Organisation</th>
<th>ABN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney C of E Grammar School Council (Shore)</td>
<td>60 352 822 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Anglican Girls School Council</td>
<td>88 512 104 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Grammar School Council</td>
<td>79 245 605 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Branwhite Clarke College Council</td>
<td>83 169 319 110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: # – 30 June year end.

5. Licences for Assistant Ministers and Stipendiary Lay Workers

The Rev Simon Roberts asked the following question –

(a) How many new licences were issued to Assistant Ministers and Stipendiary Lay Workers in 2014-15 (ie, not renewals of existing licences)?

(b) How many of these licences were issued before a Rector made a letter of offer to the applicant and before they commenced parish ministry?

(c) How many of the licence applications covered by (a) were refused?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

(a) Between 1 October 2014 and 30 September 2015 new licences (not renewals of existing licences) were issued to –

60 ordained Assistant Ministers; and

23 Stipendiary Lay Workers

A further 27 new licences were issued to Assistant Ministers as a consequence of them being ordained as a presbyter.

(b) Licences are only issued to Assistant Ministers and Stipendiary Lay Workers in parishes in accordance with a request by the Rector of the relevant parish. The Diocesan Registry has no way of knowing the date of a letter of offer to an applicant and relies upon the Rector to notify the date of commencement in the parish. Presumably a Rector would not sign a licence application for an Assistant Minister until he was satisfied that an appropriate offer and acceptance of a position was in place.

Rectors should ensure that any offers made to prospective Assistant Ministers and Stipendiary Lay Workers are subject to clearance by the Professional Standards Unit and the approval of the Archbishop.

(c) The Registry is not aware of any completed application which has been refused during the year.

6. Minimum price for the sale of Bishopscourt

Mr Bruce York asked the following question –

My question concerns what is the process for the evaluation of the minimum acceptable selling price of Bishopscourt.

I understand the Standing Committee Subcommittee was not satisfied by the private auction best offer and therefore the sale process was not concluded. However for understandable commercial reasons the best price offer was never stated and therefore my question concerns what the process was in determining minimum acceptable price. I would take this to mean that someone did the sums on the current costs of running Bishopscourt compared to the estimate of costs in running another Archbishop’s residence. The difference would be
capitalised at current Glebe Board earnings rate (say about 4%) and this plus the funds required to purchase a new residence would determine the minimum acceptable price. Has something like this been undertaken by the Subcommittee please? Hopefully the final sale would be substantially greater that this minimum to provide for funds to be invested for the benefit of the Endowment of the See.

The Synod will also need to be reasonably satisfied that the sale has been properly evaluated not only on financial grounds but also on non-financial grounds.

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

This question is out of order under business rule 6.3(4) in that it contains assertions, expresses opinions and offers an argument.

Nonetheless I can make the following general comments.

The minimum price for the sale of Bishopscourt is determined by Standing Committee after a recommendation on an offer to purchase has been made to it by the Property Trust.

The Property Trust has not made any recommendation on a sale price to the Subcommittee of the Standing Committee.

Synod may be aware that while media speculation has suggested a sale price in the order of $25m, for commercial in confidence reasons the Property Trust does not comment on such speculation.

The Property Trust also notes Synod’s requirement that up to $7m from the sale proceeds is required to be applied towards the purchase of a new residence for the Archbishop and his family, so determination of a minimum sale price necessarily needs to balance the ongoing cost of operating Bishopscourt, including the maintenance of a routine capital expenditure program and achieving a sale at a level that will ensure that the sale proceeds over and above $7m is of sufficient size to generate an appropriate investment return over the longer term.

7. **Review of Ethical Investment Policy**

The Rev Katrina Haggar asked the following question –

In their review of the Ethical Investment Policy has the Glebe Administration Board considered extending negative screens to cover businesses that use sexualised or porn-inspired advertising? If so, why is this not included in the report? If not, why not?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

No. In reviewing the scope of the negative screens in the existing policy, Glebe Administration Board is only considering those activities which have been the subject of a specific Synod or Standing Committee resolution or direction (for example, businesses which earn revenue from pornography and gambling).

Glebe Administration Board is not aware of any specific Synod or Standing Committee resolution or direction about the matter referred to in the question.

8. **Resources for outreach to Muslims**

The Rev Dr Margaret Powell asked the following question –

What is the Diocese currently doing to equip our churches to reach Muslims for Christ in our city in the face of their increased presence among us?
To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

There are people working in our Diocese who are experienced in connecting with Muslim people and who are available to visit churches and train church members - at least 19 as well as 1 working in the academic sphere and 2 currently training in Middle East in order to return and minister in Sydney. In the past year some churches (at least 5) and 3 university campuses have taken up this opportunity.

MentAC (Mentoring Across Cultures) is an apprenticeship training program based in Greenacre and has been operational for 4 years. In this 2 year program full or part time apprenticeship trainees are given theoretical input as well as practical experience in talking with Muslim men and women about Christ. There are currently 18 coming to the formal training and this includes 5 official trainees and 3 from other denominations.

There are several courses available which can be run in small or large groups with local or specialist leaders e.g. Cross and Crescent; Friendship First (Interserve); Bridges Course (Crescent Project, AIM).

Each year Moore College teaches a number of classes on Islam and all Moore College students are given the opportunity to be part of a focussed mission.

While there is much happening in a few areas of Sydney and amongst a small number of Sydney Anglicans, there is much work to be done to equip our churches to reach our Muslim neighbours for Christ.


Mr Mark Boyd asked the following question –

(a) Can churches apply for loans from the Glebe Board?
   (i) if not, when did this process cease?
   (ii) if not, what arrangements were made for existing Glebe Board loans at that time?

(b) Were any loans refinanced to the Finance & Loans Board? If so, how many and what was the total value?

(c) How much capital does the Finance & Loans Board have?

(d) How much is available to loan?

(e) Does the Finance & Loans Board have any lending limits?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Glebe Administration Board determined in November 2013 to cease its lending business and thereby ceased making new loans to parishes. Existing GAB borrowers were notified that loan terms would continue to be honoured but they would need to seek an alternative lender at the expiry of the loan with GAB. A number of borrowers have refinanced loans with other financiers or repaid loans.

The Finance and Loans Board has refinanced some, but not all, of the former GAB loans.

The Finance and Loans Board has net assets of about $15.6m of which about $2.8m is currently available for lending to parishes and other Diocesan organisations under its Ordinance.

The Finance and Loans Board is limited by the amount of capital it has available to lend but generally lends amounts up to $750,000 for capital works on church buildings and rectories.
10. **Workers compensation for ordained clergy**

Mr Paul Fitzpatrick asked the following question –

(a) What arrangements are in place for Workers Compensation (or equivalent) for ordained clergy injured in the course of their ministry in this Diocese?

(b) Do these arrangements differ from those in place for lay people on staff at a church?

(c) If so, how and why do they differ?

(d) Would the President please advise the Synod of any recommended options for parishes to pursue in this area, especially in light of individual differences in private health cover and the potential severity of workplace injury?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

(a) Parish clergy of the Diocese of Sydney are not, generally speaking, covered by the NSW Workers Compensation system. Alternative arrangements are in place for parish clergy.

There is a Stipend Continuance Insurance plan which provides a monthly income benefit if parish clergy are totally disabled due to injury or sickness, or having been totally disabled, remain partially disabled. It is paid after 90 days have elapsed after the injury or sickness and continues until retirement or the disability ceases. Parish clergy who have completed 6 or more year’s service receive a benefit of up to 75% of the notional value of the remuneration package of a minister. Parish clergy with less than 6 years service receive a benefit of up to 75% of the notional remuneration package of a 3rd and 4th year assistant minister. The benefits are lower in the case of a partial disability. Further information is contained in the SDS facts sheet about the Stipend Continuance Insurance Plan, which will be posted with this answer in the foyer and on the SDS website [not reproduced here].

The Diocesan Sickness and Accident Fund also provides for payments to wardens to meet any short-term additional costs incurred when parish clergy are unable to perform normal ministry duties due to sickness or accident. It also provides assistance, up to certain limits, when parish clergy incur medical, hospital, rehabilitation or related expenses following an accident which occurred in the course of performing normal ministry duties, and these costs are not covered by insurance or Medicare.

(b) Yes.

(c) At a broad level the main differences are as follows –

- Workers compensation applies in relation to workplace injuries, while Stipend Continuance Insurance coverage applies whether the injury or sickness is work related or not. Given the nature of ministry it would not always be clear whether or not a minister is injured in the course of work.
- Workers compensation would provide a refund for medical and other expenses, while the Sickness and Accident fund provides assistance up to certain limits. However many expenses would also be covered by Medicare or Private Health Insurance.
- There is also the possibility of lump sum payments under workers compensation.

(d) No. Part (d) of the question is out of order under rule 6.3(4)(f) of the Synod business rules as it seeks a legal opinion.
11. **The role of the Commissary**

Mr Paul Fitzpatrick asked the following question –

What exactly is a Commissary and why does the business of Synod require that he be tabled?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Section 11 of the Constitution in the Schedule to the Anglican Church of Australia Constitution Act 1902 provides for the bishop of a diocese to appoint another bishop as a commissary who may exercise the powers vested in the diocesan bishop if the diocesan bishop is absent from the Province of NSW.

The word “commissary” is derived from the word “commission”. The Commissary acts in commission with the Archbishop in fulfilling his diocesan duties when he is unavailable to do so.

Rule 1.2 of the Synod Business Rules provides that the Commissary will preside at Synod in the absence of the Archbishop.

Rule 3.2(d) of the Synod Business Rules requires that the appointment of the commissary be tabled. The rule provides for the transparent and efficient running of the Synod in the event that the Archbishop is unavailable to preside.

12. **Special Religious Education in public schools**

Mrs Alison Woof asked the following question –

Concerning Special Religious Education (SRE) in public schools in New South Wales.

(a) How many students are taught Primary SRE by people overseen by the Diocese? How many teachers and helpers do we deploy in this ministry?

(b) How many students are taught High School SRE by people overseen by the Diocese? How many teachers and helpers do we deploy in this ministry?

(c) Regarding the banning of High School SRE resources earlier this year –
   (i) was the Diocese aware of the ban before it was in place?
   (ii) if the answer to (c)(i) is “yes”, what advocacy did the Diocese perform at that time to attempt to stop the ban before it was in place?
   (iii) what advocacy did the Diocese perform after the ban was put in place?

(d) Regarding the changes to the Enrolment form for SRE –
   (i) was the Diocese aware of the changes to the Enrolment form before they were in place?
   (ii) if the answer to (d)(i) is “yes”, what advocacy did the Diocese undertake at that time to attempt to stop the changes to the Enrolment form before they were in place?
   (iii) what advocacy did the Diocese perform after the changes to the Enrolment form were put in place?
   (iv) does the Diocese have an estimate of the contraction in the number of students enrolled for SRE due to those changes? If so, what is that estimate?

(e) Regarding the banning of Special Religious Instruction (SRI) in Victoria, what liaison has been performed by the Diocese with the providers of SRI in Victoria and the Dioceses in Victoria to learn from that experience to ensure such a ban does not occur in New South Wales?

To which the President replied –
I am informed that the answer is as follows –

(a) 2,300 SRE teachers and helpers and an estimated 80,000 students.

(b) Approximately 200 SRE Teachers and an estimated 30,000 students.

(c) There was a Ministerial directive to immediately disallow the use of three high school resources in public and secondary schools, though the Department claims it was not a ban.

   (i) No.

   (ii) Not applicable.

   (iii) As the directive came from the Minister, the Archbishop immediately sought an appointment with the Minister for Education, which was granted the following week. The outcome of this meeting was to reinstate the two books in the high school curriculum. One of the books, Teen Sex by the Book, was not part of the SRE curriculum despite the Minister’s directive including this publication.

Senior Youthworks staff also met with representatives of the Department a week after the directive and requested an explanation for the directive and the process by which it was implemented.

The Diocesan Secretary and the SDS Legal Counsel also met with the Department’s Legal Counsel in an effort to understand the legal basis, if any, for the Department’s action.

(d) (i) Yes. The Director of EdComm was aware of the proposed changes as a member of the Department’s SRE Consultative Committee.

   (ii) Advocacy was made by both the Executive Director of EdComm, Dr Bryan Cowling and by the Archbishop who supplied and advocated alternative forms in writing.

   (iii) Dr Cowling is in ongoing conversations with the Department as the new enrolment form for 2016 was released last week. The Archbishop continues to have an active interest in this area.

      A representative from Anglican Youthworks liaised with representatives from the other SRE providers to advocate for the 2014 changes to be overturned and for a new form be developed that better reflected the legislation regarding SRE in the school program.

   (iv) Youthworks has received significant anecdotal evidence that the changes did have a material and negative impact on some schools. Sales of Youthworks’ SRE resources were down approximately 10% within one year. Several factors have contributed to the contraction in the number of students enrolled in SRE. At least some of that decline may be attributed to the 2014 changes to the Enrolment form that was put in place.

(e) The SRE Office Director has been contacted by Victorian ACCESS ministries to discuss how we respond to the changing environment around SRE.

The Standing Committee has also requested a report from EdComm concerning SRI in Victoria and its implications for NSW. It is anticipated that this report will be provided to the November 2015 meeting of the Standing Committee.

13. Current Commissary

Mr Daniel Armishaw asked the following question –
Who is the current Commissary?

To which the President replied –

From time to time I sign a document appointing a Commissary. The appointment only comes into effect when I am absent from the Province of New South Wales.

On some occasions the person who usually acts as the Commissary may be absent or unable to act and therefore it is usual practice for the appointment document to list a number of bishops to act as may be needed.

By a document signed by me on 25 September 2015, the following were appointed as Commissary in the order shown –

- Bishop Robert Forsyth
- Bishop Ivan Lee
- Bishop Peter Hayward
- Bishop Chris Edwards
- Bishop Peter Lin

14. **Average weekly service attendance in the Diocese related to Connect09**

Mrs Pamela Shaw asked the following question –

I recall that at the Synod in 2014 someone on the floor stated that the number of parishioners in the Diocese went down after the commencement of the first Connect mission.

Can we please have the relevant numbers of parishioners in the Diocese –

(a) before Connect 1,
(b) after introduction of Connect 1.

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

There is no way of knowing the number of parishioners in the Diocese however each year the Diocesan Registry receives returns from parishes about average weekly service attendance. The attendance numbers for 2013 are shown on page 128 of the 2015 Year Book.

Assuming the reference to "Connect 1" in the question means what was known as Connect 09, I can advise that the total average weekly service attendance for the whole diocese in the relevant years were –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>50,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>51,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>53,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **Itinerant preachers employed by Evangelism and New Churches**

The Rev Matthew Lemsing asked the following question –

How many itinerant preachers and how many student ministers has Evangelism Ministries employed each year from 2005 to the present?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The number of itinerant preachers employed by Evangelism and New Churches ranged from 2 to 6 over the period.
ENC engaged either 5 or 6 student ministers from 2005 to 2009, none from 2010 to 2014 and 4 in 2015.

Further details will be provided in tabular form on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

**Attachment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Itinerant preachers</th>
<th>Student ministers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. **Simplified form of the Doctrine Commission’s report into Human Sexuality and the Same Sex Marriage Debate**

The Rev Jeremy Tonks asked the following question –

Is the Archbishop aware of any plans to provide a simplified and more accessible summary of the Doctrine Commission’s “Human Sexuality … (and the same sex marriage debate)”?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

At its December 2014 meeting, the Standing Committee requested Anglican Media (in consultation with the Chair of the Doctrine Commission) to communicate the report through “the publication of a condensed version…in Southern Cross” and “the preparation and dissemination…of material conveying the key elements of the report to broader audiences”.

In March this year, Anglican Media published a feature article in Southern Cross titled “Beneath the Surface” which contained a summary of the key elements on the report. A PDF copy of the March Edition of Southern Cross can be accessed at sydneyanglicans.net.

17. **Parishes that contribute to the central Diocesan funds and organisations**

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

Are there any other parishes that contribute by ordinance to central Diocesan funds and organisations other than those listed at page 140 of Book 1 (red book)? If so, can a list be provided to Synod of the churches, the receiving funds/organisations and the annual amounts?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The answer is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.
Questions under business rule 6.3

Attachment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation/fund and Parish</th>
<th>Amount distributed in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diocesan Endowment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Laurence</td>
<td>$14,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda*</td>
<td>$3,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*From September 2015 distributions are instead made to the Synod Fund.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment of the See Expenditure Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde</td>
<td>$81,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Regional Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters Hill</td>
<td>$2,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Sydney Regional Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Street</td>
<td>$354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>$3,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>$39,782**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling Street</td>
<td>$1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick</td>
<td>$18,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georges River Regional Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>$17,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parish of Campbelltown makes contributions to the Sydney Anglican Indigenous People’s Ministry Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parish of Leichhardt makes contributions to CMS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parish of Liverpool makes contributions to the parish of Fairfield with Bossley Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parish of Malabar makes contributions to Unichurch (UNSW).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The question uses the present tense. The answer therefore includes parish contributions from investment and lease income but not one-off past contributions made from sale proceeds.
2. The list only includes contributions made under an ordinance. It should be noted that other parishes may also make direct contributions to organisations from their own funds.
3. The list does not include the payments from parishes already listed on page 140 of the Synod Book.

18. Use of Greenfield Grant money

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

In answer to my question dated 12 October 2015, on Brownfield Grants (made from a one-off distribution in 2007 from the Diocesan Endowment for various building projects) it was advised that $2.4 million was spent on “other”.

(a) Could a breakdown of this $2.4 million be provided to Synod?
(b) And if not, can an indication be given of the general purposes to which the expenditure was put?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –
All of the $2.4m was applied to supplement the Land Acquisition Levy funds used to purchase the Mission Property Committee’s most recent sites at Leppington ($1.5m) and Marsden Park ($0.9m).

19. Development of Safe Ministry Training resources

The Rev Craig Schafer asked the following question –

In relation to paragraph 48 of the Safe Ministry Board (SMB) and PSU report –

(a) Will the SMB consult with rectors as part of its considerations of online delivery of safe ministry content?

(b) Is the SMB aware if other churches in Australia are successfully using online safe ministry training?

(c) When does the SMB anticipate that is considerations will reach a conclusion?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

(a) Yes. There are also 2 Rectors who are currently members of the Safe Ministry Board (the “Board”) who bring a parish perspective to the delivery of training.

The Board would encourage any Rectors who wish to be consulted in relation to the online delivery of safe ministry training content to email the Professional Standards Unit.

The Board has also already surveyed Safe Ministry Representatives in relation to safe ministry training earlier this year. The Board has noted that there is strong support among survey respondents for an online component of the training. The Board has resolved to investigate this matter further.

(b) Yes. Hunter Bible Church on the Central Coast is one example of a church that has developed, and is using, online safe ministry training.

The Board has recently learned that another denomination is currently developing online safe ministry training for the use of its member churches. The Board will be liaising with those involved in the development of this training as part of its investigations as to what form of training may suitable and appropriate for the Sydney Diocese.

(c) It is likely that the SMB will have completed its investigations into this matter by the next session of Synod, and will have made recommendations about this matter by that time.

20. Consultation with Syrian speaking churches regarding the intake of refugees

The Rev Craig Schafer asked the following question –

In planning how best to respond to the Australian Government’s decision to accept a special intake of Syrian refugees, what consultations has Anglicare, the Archbishop or other diocesan representatives had with representatives of Syrian speaking churches in Sydney?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

I have not as yet undertaken any direct consultations with representatives of Syrian Churches in Sydney. To my knowledge, nor has Anglicare, or any other diocesan representatives.

Undertaking such consultations with representatives of Syrian churches and congregations in Sydney will of course be a consideration as the diocesan response to the special intake of refugees gains momentum in the coming months once refugees begin arriving in numbers.
21. Greenfields funding and the Land Acquisition Levy

The Rev James Warren asked the following question –

(a) Is 2% "greenfields" Land Acquisition Levy enough?

(b) If there was more money available to MPC what more could be done?

(c) What opportunities/greenfield are we missing out on that is a great shame given the development of Sydney?

(d) What amount (percentage-wise) would MPC find useful if they could request?

(e) What is holding us back in increasing this figure or asking parishes with larger incomes to contribute more?

(f) Who is best placed to reconsider whether the Land Acquisition Levy is set high enough?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Diocesan Resources Committee is responsible for providing recommendations to Standing Committee and Synod regarding the land acquisition levy and future funding of MPC.

Approximately $2 million per annum is to be raised by the land acquisition levy from 2016-2018. Synod has set the levy at 2% of parish receipts based on a number of considerations including the demand for land acquisitions and what is a feasible amount for local parishes to afford.

The MPC estimates that $17.5 million in greenfield land acquisitions and $42 million for construction of new churches is required over the next 5 years. This answer excludes the needs for new churches in brownfield areas of the Diocese.

The most recent land acquisition at Marsden Park cost $3 million, and so the levy is likely to fund 1 new site approximately every 1 1/2 years. However, this is insufficient to provide the amount of land and construct the new churches required to serve the rapid population growth in the greenfield areas of the Diocese. Greater funding would allow the MPC to make a greater number of strategic land acquisitions at a significantly reduced price. For example, in 2012 the MPC identified suitable land at Box Hill to acquire for a 2 hectare site for $2 million, however there were insufficient funds available. Land prices have now more than tripled in this time due to land rezoning and infrastructure provision, and MPC may not be able to afford to purchase a much needed church site for that locality. An increase in funding could also allow the MPC to bring forward the construction of more churches on the 5 sites acquired that are currently vacant. This would enable the MPC to facilitate the provision of churches to effectively catch up with the population growth.

The Archbishop’s New Churches for New Communities aims to raise funds for the cost of construction of new churches on MPC sites.

It is noted that a number of parishes have already recognised the funding needs of the MPC and have donated funds above and beyond the levy towards the MPC to support the mission in greenfields areas of the Diocese.

The MPC acknowledges that the need for new churches is greater than funds available, and has expressed its thankfulness to Synod for allocating the current land acquisition levy and also to parishes for their financial support. Any increase in the levy will enable MPC to provide the abovementioned land and new churches in a shorter time frame.

22. Safe Ministry training program costs

The Rev Roger Cunningham asked the following question –
Regarding Youthworks’ responsibility to implement the Safe Ministry Training program across the Diocese on behalf of the PSU, for each of the years 2013, 2014 and 2015 –

(a) What is the total expense of this undertaking broken down in the form of an itemised list?

(b) What are the sources of income currently utilised to meet this expense?

(c) What is the break-down of amounts received from each source as an itemised list?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The answer is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAFE MINISTRY</th>
<th>12.5%</th>
<th>14.0%</th>
<th>14.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Proportional to the total staff allocation to support Safe Ministry in the year received.</td>
<td>Youthworks Ministry Support employed 1.2 staff tasked to support Safe Ministry in 2013. This figure represents 12.5% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 9.6 staff.</td>
<td>Youthworks Ministry Support employed 1.2 staff tasked to support Safe Ministry in 2014. This figure represents 14% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 8.6 staff.</td>
<td>Youthworks Ministry Support employed 1.4 staff tasked to support Safe Ministry in 2015. This figure represents 14% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 9.6 staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe Ministry Item</th>
<th>2013 $</th>
<th>2014 $</th>
<th>2015 Budget $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>29,205</td>
<td>26,498</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>129,205</td>
<td>126,498</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2013 $</th>
<th>2014 $</th>
<th>2015 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries*</td>
<td>90,394</td>
<td>87,737</td>
<td>109,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff on-costs*</td>
<td>12,096</td>
<td>14,776</td>
<td>19,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/ Promotions*</td>
<td>11,875</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>22,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Fees*</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation*</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Ministry Program Expenses</td>
<td>22,108</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/ Information Technology*</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>3,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Costs</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>2,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Head Office*</td>
<td>11,962</td>
<td>13,398</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>154,459</td>
<td>143,203</td>
<td>177,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SURPLUS / DEFICIT | (25,254) | (16,705) | (37,340) |

23. Special Religious Education training program costs

The Rev Roger Cunningham asked the following question –
Regarding Youthworks’ responsibility to implement the Special Religious Education (SRE) accreditation program across the Diocese on behalf of the Archbishop, for each of the years 2013, 2014 and 2015 –

(a) What is the total expense of this undertaking broken down in the form of an itemised list?

(b) What are the sources of income currently utilised to meet this expense?

(c) What is the break-down of amounts received from each source as an itemised list?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The answer is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRE MINISTRY</th>
<th>55%</th>
<th>55%</th>
<th>55%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSUMPTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Proportional to the total staff tasked to support SRE in the year received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthworks Ministry Support employed 5.2 staff tasked to support SRE in 2013. This figure represents 55% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 9.6 staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youthworks Ministry Support employed 4.6 staff tasked to support SRE in 2014. This figure represents 55% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 8.6 staff.</td>
<td>Youthworks Ministry Support employed 5.2 staff tasked to support SRE in 2015. This figure represents 55% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 9.6 staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRE Item</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE Training</td>
<td>32,972</td>
<td>44,760</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>400,658</td>
<td>504,966</td>
<td>523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant*</td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>177,300</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>609,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>727,026</strong></td>
<td><strong>775,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Expenses</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries*</td>
<td>398,191</td>
<td>344,680</td>
<td>428,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff on-costs*</td>
<td>55,715</td>
<td>58,052</td>
<td>77,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/ Promotions</td>
<td>52,250</td>
<td>52,250</td>
<td>86,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising*</td>
<td>76,750</td>
<td>140,740</td>
<td>207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Fees*</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation*</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE Program Expenses</td>
<td>10,589</td>
<td>16,369</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/ Information Technology*</td>
<td>11,361</td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td>12,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rent*</td>
<td>8,973</td>
<td>9,681</td>
<td>9,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry*</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Head Office*</td>
<td>52,635</td>
<td>52,635</td>
<td>52,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>673,197</strong></td>
<td><strong>689,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>902,527</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SURPLUS / DEFICIT</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(63,567)</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,442</strong></td>
<td><strong>(127,527)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. **Review of Regional Councils**

The Rev Roger Cunningham asked the following question –

> When was a review of the purpose and effectiveness of Regional Councils last conducted?

To which the President replied –

> I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Standing Committee conducted a review into the effectiveness of regionalism in 2006. This was in response to a proposal in the explanatory statement for the bill for the Regions Ordinance 1995 that such a review be undertaken.

The 2006 review involved canvassing the views of regional bishops and regional councils and considered that major changes to regionalism at that time were not justified. Instead a number of minor changes were recommended and adopted by the Synod in passing the Regions Amendment Ordinance 2006.

25. **Online delivery of Safe Ministry Training**

Mrs Pat Low asked the following question –

> In light of the increasing number of our parishioners who are required to do Safe Ministry Training, has consideration been given to making the process easier (but not less rigorous) by making the theory component an online course, with a hard copy for those not wishing to do it online, to be completed and tested before a single, shorter face to face session?

To which the President replied –

> I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Consideration has not been given to structuring safe ministry training in the manner specified in the question. However, this will be taken as a suggestion to be considered by the SMB as part of its investigations into this matter referred to in the answer to Question 5. Thank you for the question.
# Elections

**Uncontested elections**

In accordance with rule 4.1(1) of the Schedule to the *Synod Elections Ordinance 2000*, I hereby certify that the following nominations of persons do not exceed the number of persons to be elected for the offices shown –

|   | **ST ANDREW'S CATHEDRAL CHAPTER**  
(Cathedral Ordinance 1969) |
|---|---|
| 1. | 1 clerical canon, elected for 4 years.  
Archdeacon Kara L Hartley  
1 lay canon, elected for 4 years.  
Mrs Catherine M Crouch |

|   | **ANGLICAN AID**  
(The Archbishop of Sydney's Anglican Aid Ordinance 2011) |
|---|---|
| 3. | 2 persons, elected for 3 years.  
Mr David P Dennis  
Mrs Emma Penzo |

|   | **ANGLICAN CHURCH PROPERTY TRUST DIOCESE OF SYDNEY**  
(Anglican Church Property Trust Diocese of Sydney Ordinance 1965) |
|---|---|
| 4. | 1 member of the clergy, elected for 6 years.  
The Rev David Ould  
1 person, elected for 6 years.  
Mr Peter J Rusbourne |

|   | **ANGLICAN EDUCATION COMMISSION**  
(Anglican Education Commission Ordinance 2006) |
|---|---|
| 5. | 2 persons, elected for 3 years.  
Mr Garry Brown OAM  
Mrs Rebecca Hall |

|   | **SYDNEY ANGLICAN HOME MISSION SOCIETY COUNCIL (ANGLICARE)**  
(Sydney Anglican Home Mission Society Ordinance 1981) |
|---|---|
| 6. | 1 member of the clergy, elected for 3 years.  
The Rev Luther R Symons  
2 persons, elected for 3 years.  
Mr Martyn Mitchell  
Mr Trevor J Ratcliff |

|   | **ANGLICAN RETIREMENT VILLAGES DIOCESE OF SYDNEY**  
(Anglican Retirement Villages Diocese of Sydney Constitution Ordinance 1961) |
|---|---|
| 7. | 2 persons, elected for 3 years.  
Archdeacon Terrance K Dein  
Mrs Amanda Robertson |
### 8. Council of Anglican Youth and Education Diocese of Sydney (YouthWorks)

*(Anglican Youth and Education Diocese of Sydney Ordinance 1919)*

- **1 member of the clergy, elected for 3 years.**
  - The Rev Christopher S Braga
- **1 lay person, elected for 3 years.**
  - Mr Craig Stevens

### 9. Arden Anglican School Council

*(Arden Anglican School Council Ordinance 1962)*

- **2 clergymen, elected for 3 years.**
  - The Rev Fergus Semler
  - The Rev Colin D Watson
- **2 persons, elected for 3 years.**
  - Mr Ian P Burrows
  - Mr Andrew Gibbons

### 10. The Council of Barker College

*(The Barker College Ordinance 1978)*

- **1 member of the clergy, elected for 3 years.**
  - The Rev John K Forsyth
- **1 lay person, elected for 3 years.**
  - Mr Mark S Tooker

### 11. Ministry Training and Development Council

*(Ministry Training and Development Council Ordinance 1989)*

- **1 clergyman, being an incumbent of an ecclesiastical unit, elected for 3 years.**
  - The Rev Antony G E Barraclough
- **1 lay person, elected for 3 years.**
  - Miss Deborah J Earnshaw

### 12. Department of Evangelism and New Churches Board

*(Department of Evangelism and New Churches Ordinance 2010)*

- **1 member of the clergy, elected for 3 years.**
  - The Rev Andrew P Katay
- **1 lay person, elected for 3 years.**
  - Mrs Ruth Colvin

### 13. The Council of the Illawarra Grammar School

*(The Illawarra Grammar School Ordinance 1958)*

- **1 clergy man, elected for 4 years.**
  - The Rev Peter J Hutchinson
- **2 lay persons, elected for 4 years.**
  - Professor A Okely
  - Mr Jeff Reilly
| 14. | MACARTHUR ANGLICAN SCHOOL COUNCIL  
(Macarthur Anglican School Ordinance 1982)  
2 persons, elected for 3 years.  
The Rev Paul Davey  
Mr Timothy Mackie |
|---|---|
| 15. | THE MISSION TO SEAFARERS, SYDNEY PORT COMMITTEE  
(Synod Resolution 10/63)  
2 persons, elected for 2 years.  
Mr Jeremy G Freeman  
The Rev Justin M Moffatt |
| 16. | MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE COUNCIL  
(Moore Theological College Ordinance 2009)  
1 member of the clergy, elected for 3 years.  
Canon Kevin M Kim  
2 lay persons, elected for 3 years.  
Dr Robert Tong AM  
Dr Diana W Warren |
| 20. | COUNCIL OF ST CATHERINE’S SCHOOL, WAVERLEY  
(St Catherine’s School Waverley Ordinance 1922)  
1 member of the clergy, elected for 3 years.  
The Rev Joshua L T Ng  
2 lay persons, elected for 3 years.  
Dr Jennifer A Matthei  
Mrs Kim Millar |
| 21. | SYDNEY CHURCH OF ENGLAND FINANCE AND LOANS BOARD  
(Sydney Church of England Finance and Loans Board Ordinance 1957)  
1 member of the clergy, elected for 3 years.  
The Rev Eric Cheung  
2 lay persons, elected for 3 years.  
Ms Emma May Jonceski  
Assoc. Professor Alan Kilgore |
| 22. | SYDNEY ANGLICAN SCHOOLS CORPORATION  
(Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation Ordinance 1947)  
1 member of clergy, elected for 3 years.  
The Rev Peter Greenwood  
3 persons, elected for 3 years.  
Mr Gregory A Catto  
Mrs Julie Pearson |
### 24. SYNOD POOL

*(Parish Disputes Ordinance 1999)*

12 members of the clergy elected by clerical members of the Synod, for 3 years. Of the 12 clergy elected by the clerical members of Synod, at least 9 must be incumbents.

- The Rev Andrew R Bruce
- The Rev Neil A Flower
- The Rev Nigel E J Fortescue
- The Rev Rajeev Gupta
- The Rev Thomas M Hargreaves
- The Rev Stuart R Pearson
- The Rev Gavin M Poole
- The Rev Craig W Roberts
- The Rev Martin B Robinson
- The Rev Ronald G Robinson
- The Rev Philip J Wheeler
- The Rev Ian J Wood

12 lay persons elected by lay members of the Synod, for 3 years.

- Mrs Deborah L Blackwell
- Mrs Jennifer M Everist
- Ms Jennifer Katherine Lum
- Mr Peter Mayrick
- Mr Andrew J McLachlan
- Mr Malcolm J Purvis
- Ms Karen Ray
- Dr Karin N Sowada
- Miss Joanna K Warren
- Miss Alicia J Watson
- Mr Peter S Wilson

### 25. COUNCIL OF TARA ANGLICAN SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

*(Tara Anglican Girls' School Ordinance 1956)*

1 member of the clergy, elected for 3 years.

- The Rev Ian J Wood

2 persons, elected for 3 years.

- Mr Greg Ellem
- Mr Glenn L Wilkins

### 26. COUNCIL OF TRINITY GRAMMAR SCHOOL

*(Trinity Grammar School Constitution Ordinance 1928)*

1 clergy man elected for 1 year.

- The Rev Justin M Moffatt

2 clergy men, elected for 3 years.

- The Rev Dane H Courtney
- The Rev Trevor J W Oakley

2 lay persons, elected for 3 years.

- Mr Peter Bakunowicz
- Mr Richard M Pegg
| 27. | **WILLIAM BRANWHITE CLARKE COLLEGE COUNCIL**  
**William Branwhite Clarke College Ordinance 1987**  
1 member of the clergy, elected for 3 years.  
The Rev Martin S Kemp  
1 lay person, elected for 3 years.  
Mr Matthew A Smith |

| D M GLYNN | 21 September 2015 |
| Returning Officer | Date |

I HEREBY DECLARE the persons named above to be elected to the office shown.

| G N DAVIES | 12 October 2015 |
| Archbishop of Sydney | Date |
Resolutions

1/15 Yoga and other such activities

Synod, noting the report on Yoga and other such activities in response to Synod Resolution 16/14, thanks the Social Issues Committee for its work on this matter and –

(a) emphasises that Christians are called to obey the first commandment ‘You shall have no other Gods before me’ and thus must, as Christ’s disciples, avoid participating in the worship of false gods;

(b) recommends that individual Christians should exercise discernment with respect to yoga and other such practices, which may or may not contain elements of worship of other gods;

(c) advises churches not to rent out their premises to yoga classes on account of the spiritual confusion this may cause;

(d) advises schools, and other Anglican institutions not to engage in yoga and other such practices, but to seek alternative means of promoting health and well-being; and

(e) urges Anglicans, clergy and laity alike, to consider the missional significance of the widespread uptake of yoga by Australians of Western European cultural background in recent decades.

(The Rev Ian Millican 12/10/2015)

2/15 Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee

Synod agrees to amend the terms of the resolution of the Synod by which the Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee is constituted (35/09) in the manner shown in the following marked form of the resolution –

“Synod agrees to form a Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee (TEMOC), consisting of 9 persons elected by Synod, for a 3 year term and one person appointed by the Archbishop, with the Committee having the additional power to co-opt and up to three more persons appointed by the Committee.

A person who is elected or appointed as a member of the Committee after the 2nd session of the 50th Synod must, before attending a meeting of the Committee, lodge with the Committee for safe-keeping a signed statement of personal faith in the form set out in Appendix 3 of the Synod’s Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations.

On the first day of each ordinary session of the Synod, 3 members elected by the Synod are to retire. Such members are those who have held office longest since last being elected but, in the case of competition, are to be determined by the members concerned or, if these members cannot agree, the order of retirement is to be determined by lot. The members appointed by the Archbishop or the Committee are to hold office for a period of 3 years. In any case, a retiring member is eligible for re-election or re-appointment.

The Committee is to be charged with furthering ministry to students in tertiary education throughout the Diocese, including responsibility for –

(a) recruiting, training and supporting University and technical and further education chaplains and promoting their ministries,

(b) the allocation of resources in accordance with strategic priorities, which it should report to Synod via the Standing Committee once formulated,

(c) in consultation with appropriate bodies, preparing for Synod’s consideration a diocesan policy framework, measurable goals and strategies on ministry in TAFE and other VET (vocational education and training) institutes, and also a policy on ministry in private HEPs (higher education providers),

(d) exploring the possibility of further creative partnerships with Anglican University colleges, AFES, Anglican Education Commission and other relevant bodies, and

(e) encouraging the support of tertiary education ministry from other sources, and agrees that the Interim Committee appointed by Standing Committee be the Committee until such time as Synod elections can be held.”

(Professor Christopher Bellenger 12/10/2015)
3/15 Training in emergency and other safe ministry procedures

Synod requests the Standing Committee to review the form, content and timing of training required of parishioners involved in relevant ministries in relation to safe ministry including –
(a) child protection and protection of other vulnerable individuals,
(b) work health and safety,
(c) emergency procedures, and
(d) food safety
to ensure that –
(i) the necessary training and consequent accreditation is provided in a cost-effective and timely manner,
(ii) can be readily monitored by parishes and the Diocese as well as
(iii) ensuring compliance with legislative changes, emerging community standards and the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

In particular, consideration be given to including hands-on training for Emergency Control/Coordination Team members in the use of firefighting equipment in a three-year cycle of accreditation, in conjunction with existing safe ministry training if practical.

(Mr David Minty 12/10/2015)

4/15 Preparation of parish histories

Synod asks parishes which prepare parish histories and similar publications to lodge complimentary copies with the Diocesan Archives and the Moore College Library to ensure the long term availability of these important documents.

(Mr Doug Marr 12/10/2015)

5/15 The Rev Stuart Abrahams

Synod records with thanks to God for the life and ministry of the Rev Stuart Noel Abrahams AM and his service of his Lord and Saviour in his many ministry responsibilities in the diocese of Sydney.

Following an early career in real estate, Stuart was a student at Moore College from 1959 to 1961. Stuart was ordained in 1962 and served as Curate at Wollongong, then from 1964 to 1966 he was the Home Secretary of CMS New South Wales. Then followed time as Rector at Northbridge (1966-73), St Andrew’s Wahroonga (1973-77) and Nowra (1977-1984).

In March 1984 Archbishop Robinson asked Stuart to become the Director of the Vision for Growth Appeal. In mid-1992 Stuart took on the role of being the Director of the Archbishop’s Ministry and Support Appeals Unit. For a period in 1997 and 1998 Stuart served as Chief Executive Officer of Anglican Youth and Education Diocese of Sydney.

After retirement, Stuart continued to serve others by ministering in parishes and in a variety of other ways. In 1996 he was instrumental in establishing the Hamlin Fistula Relief and Aid Fund to raise money to support the work in Ethiopia of Dr Catherine Hamlin. Stuart maintained a close and active interest in the work of Dr Hamlin until his death.

On Australia Day 2009 Stuart became a Member of the Order of Australia (AM) “for service to international humanitarian aid through the establishment and administration of the Hamlin Fistula Relief and Aid Fund, and to the Anglican Church of Australia”.

In all his spheres of his ministry, Stuart offered a personal and caring Christian ministry and a commitment to evangelism.

Synod sends its condolences to Billie, Stuart’s widow, and to the other members of his family.

(Bishop Peter Hayward 12/10/2015)
6/15 Purpose and nature of episcopal leadership

Synod requests the Diocesan Doctrine Commission to prepare a report for the 1st Session of the 51st Synod in 2017 on the purpose and nature of episcopal leadership, giving particular consideration to the nature of episcopal and archiepiscopal ministry in a diocese such as ours where there are assistant bishops, and provide both a biblical and theological rationale as well as a practical description of the roles, responsibilities and priorities of bishops and archbishops.

(The Rev Simon Flinders 12/10/2015)

7/15 The NSW Government and Problem Gambling Harm Minimisation

Synod laments deeply that more than a year later, there has been no significant response from the NSW Government towards the recommendations in the report of the NSW Legislative Council’s Select Committee on the Impact of Gambling published in August 2014.

Synod again grieves that NSW has above-average expenditure on gambling on a per capita basis compared to national averages.

Therefore Synod again commends the report’s recommendations and urges the NSW Government to implement effective gambling harm-minimisation measures, as a matter of high priority, in particular –

(a) introducing a $1 maximum bet limit for poker machines in New South Wales,
(b) stopping the disproportionate concentration of poker machines in lower socioeconomic areas, where they create greater harm,
(c) implementing a freeze on the transfer of machine entitlements between venues and the creation of any new entitlements,
(d) implementing a third-party exclusion scheme in the state’s clubs and hotels by 2017,
(e) developing a scheme that requires venues to intervene to assist problem gamblers,
(f) responding to research on the relationship between gaming machine design features and gambling harms, and
(g) approaching the Australian Government to request that a set of standards be established for online wagering websites.

(Canon Sandy Grant 12/10/2015)

8/15 Alternative forms of Anglican Church

For the purpose of greater missional fruitfulness, the Synod requests the Archbishop to establish a working group that will investigate the formation of alternative forms of Anglican Church –

(a) that are theologically Anglican,
(b) that are shaped by the principles for Christian community voiced to us by the New Testament,
(c) that are specifically designed to penetrate and engage with the multiplicity of non-Christian spiritual and cultural worlds in which the majority of Australians now live, and
(d) that are not necessarily required to owe anything to our traditional (Christendom-form) parish model.

Further, that the working group report back to Synod 2016 with specific and concrete proposals for the initiation of a process to create such alternative forms of church.

(The Rev Dr Martin Bragger 12/10/2015)

9/15 Licensing of incumbents

Synod requests Standing Committee, in consultation with the Archbishop, to report to the next session of Synod on –

(a) the basis on which clergy are licensed as incumbents in the Diocese, and
(b) whether there are circumstances where the present practice should be modified.

(The Rev Philip Wheeler 12/10/2015)
10/15 Evangelism in the Diocese

Synod, under the call of the 2020 Diocesan Mission Priority 1 to reach all the lost with the life-giving gospel of Christ, encourages –

(a) parishes and diocesan organisations to participate in deliberate prayer for evangelism asking God to open doors for the proclamation of Jesus amongst family, friends, and neighbours and community of their ministry context,

(b) parishes and diocesan organisations to deliberately plan for evangelism in their local ministry context,

(c) Mission area groups to deliberately plan, partner, resource, and equip local church members for evangelism appropriate to their context,

(d) parishes and diocesan organisations to participate in evangelism that is reaching the lost with the life giving gospel of Christ.

(The Rev Gavin Parsons 12/10/2015)

11/15 Freedom Sunday 18 October 2015

Synod notes that slavery existed in various forms from ancient times, and likewise continues today, often involving child labour, sexual exploitation, and human trafficking.

Among other Scriptures that touch on the issue, Synod rejoices that even when urging personal contentment in our various circumstances, 1 Corinthians 7:21-23 encourages slaves to gain their freedom if they can and reminds them that they are the Lord's freed persons when called to faith in Christ. Being bought by Christ at a great price, Christians know that the trafficking of humans for the purpose of the enslavement of one human being by another is never desirable in God's economy.

Synod also recalls with gratitude the involvement of William Wilberforce and all involved in the fight against the slave trade in the late 1700s and the early 1800s.

Therefore Synod commends to parishes' consideration observance of 'Freedom Sunday', on Sunday, 18 October 2015, and draws attention to the prayer resources prepared by the Rev Dr David Höhne of the Social Issues Committee for the occasion.

(Dr Karin Sowada 12/10/2015)

12/15 Special Religious Education

Synod supports and values the ministry of Special Religious Education (SRE), and encourages the Archbishop, Anglican Youthworks, the Anglican Education Commission and parish Rectors to work together, including through the Archbishop's SRE Taskforce, and individually, to protect and expand that ministry.

Synod assures the Archbishop’s SRE Taskforce of its prayers as it responds to multiple threats upon SRE, and encourages Freedom 4 Faith as it promotes and protects religious freedoms in Australia, to provide legal advice to the Archbishop's SRE Taskforce.

Synod affirms the Diocese's long standing support of public school education, and commends the Diocese's 2,500 volunteer SRE teachers and helpers for their passion and commitment to the work of providing religious education to school children in the state schools within the boundaries of the Diocese.

(The Rev Zac Veron 12/10/2015)

13/15 Study into effective church planting

Synod, noting –

(i) the Study into Effective Church Planting in the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, and

(ii) the Mission 2020 goals to plant 15 new churches in greenfield areas and at least two new churches per mission area by 2020.
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(a) encourages rectors and parish councils to consider how they could initiate church planting in their parishes, or partner with other parishes to support church planting elsewhere in the Diocese,

(b) requests that Evangelism and New Churches (“ENC”), in view of the decreased rates of church planting in this Diocese in recent years, to provide recommendations as to –
   (i) how recruitment and training of potential church planters may be improved,
   (ii) the identification of church planting opportunities with regard to strategic planning at a regional level,
   (iii) the most effective method of identifying resources and assets to assist church planting,
   (iv) effective methods to address conflict resolution in the context of church planting,
   (v) how funding models underpinning the different styles of church planting in the Diocese could be enhanced,
   (vi) how the role and resourcing of ENC may be improved in order to better support church planting in this Diocese, and

(c) requests that the Standing Committee consider appropriate ways of providing financial support to church plants in brownfields areas, and report their findings to the next session of Synod.

(Bishop Peter Lin 12/10/2015)

14/15 Doctrine Commission report on fellowship meals for the proclamation of the Lord’s death

This Synod –

(a) notes that Standing Committee declined the request of Synod expressed in resolution 7/14, since the report referred to in the resolution was a draft report of the Doctrine Commission,

(b) thanks the Doctrine Commission for their work in producing the final report concerning Fellowship meals for the proclamation of Christ’s death, and

(c) receives the final report and resolves that it be printed at the discretion of the Standing Committee.

(Dr Barry Newman 12/10/2015)

15/15 Incorporation of dioceses

Synod requests the Standing Committee ask the Anglican Church Property Trust and the Royal Commission Steering Committee to review the decision of all Victorian Anglican dioceses to incorporate in response to both workers’ compensation issues and the emerging findings of the Royal Commission on Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, and consider the advantages and disadvantages of such action for NSW dioceses in current circumstances.

(Mr David Minty 12/10/2015)

16/15 Doctrine Commission’s report “A theology of Christian assembly”

That this Synod –

(a) requests the Diocesan Doctrine Commission to revisit its report “A theology of Christian assembly” (4 September 2008), and

(b) noting that the Commission’s current report –
   (i) makes no reference to WORSHIP, and
   (ii) makes only passing reference to PRAYER,

requests the Commission to give due consideration to (and advice on) the proper place for worship and prayer in Christian assembly.

(Dr David Oakenfull 13/10/2015)

17/15 Campus Bible Study, Unichurch and the Fellowship of Overseas Christian University Students

This Synod gives great thanks to God that the year 2015 marks 40 years since the commencement of Campus Bible Study (CBS) and Unichurch and 30 years since the commencement of the Fellowship of Overseas Christian University Students (FOCUS) at the University of NSW.
Synod gives thanks for the faithful ministry over these years of the Revs Phillip Jensen, Paul Grimmond and Carl Matthei at CBS and Unichurch and Joshua Ng at FOCUS. Synod particularly gives thanks for the many people who have, as a result of God using these ministries, come to know Jesus as their Lord and Saviour and also those who have entered full-time pastoral ministry in evangelical churches in Australia or have gone onto the overseas mission field.

Synod notes with thankfulness and recognises that a celebration of these ministries will be held on Saturday 31 October at the Clancy Auditorium at the University of NSW.

This Synod commits to pray for the present generation of students and the ministry teams led by the Revs Carl Matthei and Joshua Ng.

(Dr Robert Tong 13/10/2015)

18/15 CMS Mission Aid Group in Tanzania

This Synod notes that the CMS Mission Aid Group (MAG) will close at the end of this year after 34 years of service to the Tanzanian Church. We praise God for those people who have served in this way over many years and pray that He will continue to bless the Tanzanian Church in the future.

(Dr Rodney James 13/10/2015)

19/15 Bishop Ivan Lee

Synod notes that Bishop Ivan Lee is scheduled for, major surgery on 26 October and encourages all parishes to pray for his health, impending surgery and for a swift recovery, and that the God of all comfort would pour out his comfort on Bishop Lee, Virginia and their family at this time.

(The Rev Raj Gupta 13/10/2015)

20/15 The Rev Dr Michael Stead

Synod gives thanks to God for the appointment of the Rev Dr Michael Stead as the next Bishop of South Sydney and looks forward to his leadership and partnership with the parishes and the South Sydney Regional Council in furthering the spread of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ in the region. The Synod warmly welcomes Dr Stead, his wife Felicity and their family as they minister with us in this area of the Diocese.

(Miss Alicia Watson 13/10/2015)

21/15 Chaplaincy in public schools

Synod encourages all those associated with the ministry of chaplaincy in public schools and assures them of our continued prayers.

(The Rev Richard Wenden 13/10/2015)

22/15 Proposal for a Property Receipts Levy

Synod –

(i) noting the Large Property Receipts Policy (“LPRP”) approved in principle at its last session in October 2014,

(ii) noting its request that the Standing Committee consult with parishes about the LPRP with a view to bringing a revised form to this session,

(iii) noting the revised form of the LPRP included in the Standing Committee’s report to Synod on this matter (“Report”) together with an outline of a possible Property Receipts Levy as an alternative to the LPRP,

(iv) noting that during the consultation process some parishes indicated a preference for a form of Property Receipts Levy instead of a LPRP,

agrees that a Property Receipts Levy along the lines described in the Report may be preferable to a LPRP, and therefore requests the Standing Committee to collect the necessary financial data from parishes, and
undertake the necessary modelling and further consultation to bring to the Synod no later than its session in 2020 a proposal for a Property Receipts Levy to be considered as an alternative to a LPRP.

(The Rev Craig Roberts 13/10/2015)

23/15 Special Religious Education and Safe Ministry training accreditation

Synod recognises and affirms the importance of ensuring that the delivery of Special Religious Education in primary and secondary schools is of the highest quality, and is grateful to Youthworks for their efforts to this end in recent years.

Synod –
(a) recognising that it is vital that SRE teachers be thoroughly trained,
(b) noting that current authorisation arrangements for local trainers allow them to provide training for members of their own and only one other parish, and
(c) acknowledging that it is difficult for remote parishes to rely on volunteers to provide local training on an infrequent basis, and uneconomical for Youthworks to provide training in remote areas, requests Youthworks to revise accreditation policies (for both SRE Accreditation and Safe Ministry training) so that rectors are empowered to determine whether a suitably accredited local trainer from another parish possesses the capacity to provide effective training for members of their own parish.

(The Rev Anthony Douglas 13/10/2015)

24/15 Safe Ministry Policy

Synod –
(a) affirms the following diocesan Safe Ministry Policy Statement adopted by the Synod in Motion 18/04 –

“The Anglican Church of Australia is committed to the physical, emotional and spiritual welfare and safety of all people, particularly within its own community. To ensure the safety of children and vulnerable people in our communities, the Church will –
• carefully recruit and train its clergy and church workers,
• adopt and encourage safe ministry practices by its clergy and church workers,
• respond promptly to each concern raised about the behaviour of its clergy and church workers,
• offer pastoral support to any person who has suffered abuse, and
• provide supervision of and pastoral accountability to any person known to have abused a child or another vulnerable person.”,

(b) encourages all parishes and organisations that have not adopted the diocesan Safe Ministry Policy Statement to do so,
(c) recognises the SafeMinistry.org.au website as an important access point for survivors of abuse in the Diocese of Sydney for seeking information and support and for reporting abuse,
(d) commends the SafeMinistry.org.au website to parishes in the Diocese of Sydney for safe ministry support, information and resources,
(e) recommends each parish adopt the Safe Ministry Journey policies for Parishes, and specifically the policy documents for those serving in the following roles –
(i) Ministers
(ii) Safe Ministry Representatives
(iii) Head of Youth Ministry
(iv) Youth Ministry Leaders
(v) Head of Children’s Ministry
(vi) Children’s Ministry Leaders.

(Mr Doug Marr 14/10/2015)
25/15 Communion with the Anglican Church in North America

Synod declares it is in communion with the Anglican Church in North America (ACNA) so long as communion is consistent with the Fundamental Declarations contained in the 1961 Constitution.

(The Rev David Ould 14/10/2015)

26/15 Importance of Special Religious Education

This Synod –
(a) affirms the goodness and importance of the gospel of Christ crucified and risen, and the knowledge of God and of ourselves as revealed in the Bible for the development of children and young people,
(b) affirms the importance of Special Religious Education (SRE) to the lives of NSW public school children as a means of developing their own personal values and beliefs,
(c) values the opportunity given to all parents/caregivers in the NSW government school system to have SRE of their choice provided for their children,
(d) values the priority given to SRE during the normal school timetable,
(e) respects the right of parents to object to their child receiving SRE and withdrawing them from SRE,
(f) values the development and implementation of SRE Curriculum authorised by approved providers outside the Board of Studies NSW syllabuses,
(g) values the partnership with principals and school communities in seeing SRE as an integral part of school activities, taking place in school hours and under the jurisdiction of the school,
(h) encourages all incumbents to ensure the highest quality of delivery of SRE in the schools for which they are responsible, including ensuring all SRE teachers are suitably trained, supervised and accredited, and to welcome any systems and procedures to ensure this is occurring,
(i) encourages Anglican Youthworks to pursue the ongoing development and enhancement of contemporary, age-appropriate curriculum which links with the training given to SRE volunteer teachers, and where appropriate, reflects the broad learning outcomes for government school students, and
(j) supports the Archbishop, bishops, clergy and other parties as they engage in clear, timely public and unified advocacy and defence of the Diocese’s current SRE rights, program and policy.

(The Rev Christopher Braga 14/10/2015)

27/15 Connection with our Muslim neighbours

That a working group be formed in association with Moore College, and chaired by the Head of the Department of Mission, to develop material and an organised and comprehensive approach that will motivate, educate and equip our churches to connect with our Muslim neighbours in culturally appropriate ways in order to commend Christ to them – not from fear but because the love of Christ compels us. That the committee include the mover and the Reverends John Bales and Bruce Hall.

(The Rev Dr Margaret Powell 14/10/2015)

28/15 Ministry in socially disadvantaged areas

Synod –
(i) noting the “Dropping off the Edge 2015” report by Jesuit Social Services and Catholic Social Services Australia which observes “consistent place-based disadvantage” in Australia and that in NSW “a significant number of postcodes have remained depressed for long periods demonstrating the persistent, entrenched nature of the disadvantage experienced by these communities”,
(ii) noting the Anglicare August 2015 Parish Disadvantage Report which –
(A) highlights the fact that successful ministry in such areas of disadvantage require particularly focused targeting of resources from outside those areas, and
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(B) recommends that the Diocese, both corporately and from individual parishes, should consider how best to provide those resources,

(a) thanks God for the work of Anglicare, Anglican Aid and other diocesan organisations and units which currently deliver, support and partner with such ministries,

(b) requests the Standing Committee to produce a report on how the Diocese may best support ministry in places of disadvantage in the most deliberate, effective and co-ordinated manner, including the best way to recruit, train and support leadership in these areas.

(c) requests the Standing Committee to report back to Synod at its next session on what is required to implement such a program of support.

(Bishop Peter Hayward 14/10/2015)

29/15 Government schools

Synod –

(a) reaffirms its support for public education in schools, TAFE colleges and universities,

(b) recognises the significant role that public education has played in the formation of the majority of children and young people and in the development of a civil democratic society in Australia,

(c) gives thanks to God for Christian teachers who work in government schools and recognises the strategic importance of an ongoing supply of well-trained classroom Christian teachers, Christian education leaders and Christian principals in government schools,

(d) recognises the role and focus of the Anglican Education Commission (“EdComm”) in the recruitment of Christian men and women into the teaching profession and in programs to assist them to develop as exemplary Christian teachers and leaders in secular society,

(e) calls on churches to –

(i) pray regularly for Christian teachers in their congregations who teach children and young people in government schools,

(ii) support the work of EdComm in identifying and urging teachers in their congregations teaching in government schools to become part of a local network of Christian teachers for mutual encouragement, mentoring and the sharing of ideas,

(iii) maintain and sustain the best possible relationships with school leaders, teachers and parent groups of government schools in their locality, and

(iv) pray for the work of EdComm in its advocacy role on behalf of the Diocese with governments and other agencies on a wide range of contemporary educational matters including national curriculum and teaching standards, religious education, equity, funding and religious freedom.

(Professor Christopher Bellenger 14/10/2015)

30/15 Anglican schools

Synod –

(a) (i) recognising our diocesan schools as outstanding educational institutions, each with their own unique culture, which exist to advance the educational purposes of the Diocese,

(ii) recognising that biblically shaped education seeks, among other things, to encourage the search for and commitment to truth and to cultivate, critique and seek the transformation of our culture in accordance with godly wisdom,

(iii) recognising that a commitment to biblically shaped education reinforces outstanding educational outcomes,

(iv) recognising the crucial role that an increasing number of Chaplains are taking in working alongside academic staff to assist them in conceptualising and embedding a biblically focussed worldview throughout their teaching programs,

(v) recognising that the Anglican Education Commission (“EdComm”) seeks to support Christian educators in diocesan schools to understand how biblically shaped education can be embedded in all aspects of school life,
(vi) honouring the work of all teachers in diocesan schools but recognising the special role of Christian teachers in providing an education that is informed by a biblical worldview,

(vii) recognising the need for effective mentoring of Christian teachers in how to integrate their faith with teaching practice,

(viii) recognising the need for Christian students to consider teaching as a vital vocation for the benefit of future generations,

(b) gives thanks to God for our diocesan schools and prays for the work of our schools in educating young men and women,

(c) calls on our diocesan schools to work collaboratively with EdComm –

(i) to equip all their teaching staff to understand what it means to work in an Anglican Christian educational institution,

(ii) to support and mentor Christian teachers in the integration of their faith and teaching practice, and

(iii) to prioritise the recruitment and training of Christian teachers,

(d) calls on the churches of our Diocese –

(i) to acknowledge the importance of the work of its members who are teachers and support them in prayer, and

(ii) to support the work of EdComm through prayer and in identifying and urging teachers in their parishes to become a part of local networks of Christian teachers for mutual Christian encouragement, mentoring and the sharing of ideas, and

(e) encourages partnerships between EdComm, Anglican University chaplains and evangelical Christian university groups in facilitating the training and mentoring of Christian pre-service teachers.

(The Rev Dr Michael Stead 14/10/2015)

31/15 Affirmation of marriage as between a man and a woman

Synod –

(a) affirms once again that marriage, as a gift from God who made us male and female, is the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life,

(b) recalls that marriage is the symbol of God’s unending love for his people, and of the union between Christ and his Church,

(c) recognises that marriage is a bedrock institution of society, designed for its good order and the secure and loving care of children by their own mother and father,

(d) notes, nonetheless, that many children are lovingly cared for in other contexts, and affirms that the welfare of such children must be paramount, along with support for their parents and other carers,

(e) condemns any violence against or mistreatment of our neighbours who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, trans or intersex (LGBTI),

(f) calls on all Australian Christians to engage respectfully in the debate over marriage and to pray for the members of the Federal Parliament in their consideration of this matter,

(g) insists that, should the Federal Parliament decide to change the legal definition of marriage, robust provisions for freedom of speech and religion are included in relevant legislation, to protect those whose conscientious beliefs mean they cannot celebrate such a redefinition; and nevertheless,

(h) urges the Federal Parliament to uphold the classical understanding of marriage as being between a man and a woman, in accordance with current provisions of the Marriage Act 1961.

(Canon Sandy Grant 14/10/2015)

32/15 Retention of marriage licences and same-sex marriage

Synod, noting the report provided in response to resolution 31/14, declares its view that –

(a) if the definition of marriage under the Marriage Act 1961 were to be amended to allow for unions of same-sex couples to be treated as marriages under the Act, and

(b) provided clergy who are authorised as marriage celebrants under an amended Act were not legally compelled to solemnise marriages other than in accordance with God’s law, clergy should continue as authorised marriage celebrants under an amended Act in order to solemnise the marriage of a man and a woman, although it would be open for individual clergy, for example by reason of
conscience, to withdraw as an authorised celebrant in consultation with their parish. Further, it would be unnecessary and pastorally unhelpful for the Anglican Church of Australia to withdraw as a recognised denomination under the Marriage Act in such circumstances.

(Bishop Robert Forsyth 14/10/2015)

33/15 Recognition, encouragement and support of faithful Anglicans

Synod –
(a) praises God for the godly leadership of the Australian Bishops' Conference, in their unanimous adoption of the following protocol in 2014 and 2015 –

As we ordain, license or appoint to ministries within our dioceses we undertake to uphold *Faithfulness in Service*, the code of conduct for bishops adopted by the General Synod in Resolution 59/04 and as amended by the General Synod from time to time.

noting that *Faithfulness in Service* states –

7.1 The sexual conduct of clergy and church workers has a significant impact on the Church and the community.

7.2 Sexuality is a gift from God and is integral to human nature. It is appropriate for clergy and church workers to value this gift, taking responsibility for their sexual conduct by maintaining chastity in singleness and faithfulness in marriage.

7.4 You are to be chaste and not engage in sex outside of marriage.
(b) regrets the recent appointment in August 2015 of a man in a long term homosexual relationship to a ministry office in the Diocese of Gippsland, as it constitutes –

(i) a departure from the teaching of Scripture,
(ii) a departure from Lambeth Resolution 1.10 of 1998 (which rejects homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture),
(iii) a departure from *Faithfulness in Service* §7.4, and
(iv) a breach of the Australian Bishops' Protocol agreed to by all Australian bishops in 2014, 2015,
(c) views the actions of the Bishop of Gippsland as a breach of collegiality and fellowship at a profound level and which deeply grieves us,
(d) prayerfully and respectfully requests the Australian Bishops to appoint clergy and church workers in line with the expectations for elders as set forth in Scripture and in accordance with –

(i) Lambeth Resolution 1.10 of 1998,
(ii) *Faithfulness in Service* §7.4, and
(iii) the Australian Bishops' Protocol, and
(e) regrets the recent statements by the Bishop of Wangaratta, the Rt Rev John Parkes, in the media affirming that 'same-sex marriage' is compatible with Scripture, as it constitutes –

(i) a departure from the teaching of Scripture,
(ii) a departure from *Faithfulness in Service* §7.4, and
(f) views the actions of the Bishop of Wangaratta as a breach of collegiality and fellowship at a profound level and which deeply grieves us,
(g) praises God for the recent formation of the Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans in Australia and, in the light of the actions of the Bishops of Gippsland and Wangaratta, encourages our Bishops and Standing Committee to look for ways to recognise, encourage and support those faithful Anglicans who are disenfranchised by such actions, and to reach those elements of society denied a faithful presentation of the gospel, and
(h) requests that a copy of this resolution be circulated to all bishops and assistant bishops in the Anglican Church of Australia.

(The Rev Dominic Steele 14/10/2015)

34/15 Diocesan Doctrine Commission report on Human Sexuality

Synod thanks the Sydney Diocesan Doctrine Commission for its recent publication *Human Sexuality & the Same-Sex Marriage Debate* and commends it to the churches of the Diocese for the clarification and confirmation of the biblical theology of human sexuality and commits to pray for those in our community who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans or intersex (LGBTI).
Synod requests Standing Committee to continue its work of developing pastoral guidelines for pastors as they minister to Christians experiencing same-sex attraction, their family and friends, and their churches; and that a committee be formed of sufficient size, breadth of experience, and expertise to accomplish this, to report to Synod in 2017.

(The Rev Jim Crosweller 19/10/2015)

35/15 Review of Regional Councils

Synod requests Standing Committee to conduct a review of the purpose and effectiveness of Regional Councils.

(The Rev Roger Cunningham 19/10/2015)

36/15 Effective Ministry under God

Synod –
(a) recognises and gives thanks to God for the work of the dedicated staff of Effective Ministry;
(b) commends the online resource effectiveministry.org and encourages rectors, other clergy and lay people to visit the website, to explore the resources and to use those which suit their local ministry.

(The Rev Robin Kinstead 19/10/2015)

37/15 Priscilla and Aquila Centre

Synod, acknowledging the perfect wisdom of our Creator in making us male and female to complement each other as we work together in his world –
(a) thanks God for the work of the Priscilla and Aquila Centre at Moore College and particularly the leadership of its Director, Jane Tooher, in helping us think through the implications of God’s good design for the ministry in this Diocese, and
(b) recommends the forthcoming conference on Monday 1 February 2016 to the ministry teams of the churches and organisations represented at this Synod.

(The Rev Alistair Seabrook 19/10/2015)

38/15 Liverpool South: Reclassification as a Parish

Synod assents to the reclassification of Liverpool South as a parish with effect from 1 January 2016.

(Bishop Peter Lin 19/10/2015)

39/15 Glenmore Park: Reclassification as a Parish

Synod assents to the reclassification of Glenmore Park as a parish with effect from 1 January 2016.

(Bishop Peter Hayward 19/10/2015)

40/15 Bishop Robert Forsyth

Noting that this will be Bishop Robert Forsyth’s last Synod, Synod gives thanks to God for Bishop Forsyth’s nearly 40 years of ordained ministry both in the Diocese of Sydney and beyond. As a curate in the parishes of Glenbrook and Holy Trinity, Adelaide, as Rector of St Barnabas Broadway, and as Bishop of South Sydney, Robert has proclaimed Christ, warning and teaching with wisdom, so that people might be presented mature in Christ. As Chaplain to the University of Sydney, and for over 20 years the Chairman of The EU Graduates Fund, Robert pioneered a model of partnership with the Sydney University Evangelical Union which continues to bear fruit today. As Bishop of South Sydney, Robert has overseen a revitalisation of gospel ministry throughout the Region, with many churches turning around and a significant number of churches planted. Through his membership of the Standing Committee, the Archbishop’s liturgical panel, and the renewing structures taskforce, Robert has served the Synod with creativity and wisdom. As he moves into a new sphere of ministry, Synod thanks God for both Robert and
Margaret, and prays that he will continue both to bless them, and to bless others through them, so that Jesus Christ will be honoured as Lord and Saviour.

(The Rev Andrew Katay 19/10/2015)

41/15 Parental leave for parish clergy

Synod, noting the report Parental leave for parish clergy –
(a) agrees in principle to making provision for parental leave for parish clergy,
(b) requests Standing Committee to consider whether such provision is best made by ordinance, by policy, or by some other instrument,
(c) invites Synod members to send any comments on the exposure draft to the Diocesan Secretary by 31 December 2015 and requests the Standing Committee to take these comments into account in finalising a proposal for consideration at the 2016 session of Synod.

(Archdeacon Kara Hartley 19/10/2015)

42/15 Ministry progress and brownfields' grants

Synod gives thanks to God for the contribution of $9.32m from the Diocesan Endowment in stimulating some $43m in parish building projects, which has facilitated enhanced new ministry opportunities, measured by notable increased attendance and offertory growth in a number of those churches.

Further, noting –
(i) the report regarding Ministry Progress and Brownfields grants, and
(ii) that 70% of the growth in new housing in Sydney is anticipated to be in brownfield areas, and
(iii) the urgent desire to introduce Jesus to more people,

Synod requests that Standing Committee, in consultation with the Strategic Research Group and any other necessary parties, develop –
(a) recommendations for Synod 2016 as to how capital could be raised for the development and expansion of church facilities in brownfield areas, and
(b) appropriate criteria that could be used to ascertain suitable and strategic parishes to receive such an investment.

(The Rev Raj Gupta 19/10/2015)

43/15 The Rev Bruce Hall

Synod gives thanks to God for the work of the Rev Bruce Hall from 2012 to 2015 in carrying forward the legacy of Canon John Chapman as the Director of Evangelism and New Churches, in particular –
(a) his unceasing desire to see the gospel of Christ crucified preached to all the people of Sydney,
(b) his support for new and creative initiatives to reach people from all ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and
(c) his encouragement of new church plants under the banner of Evangelism Ministries to reach people who would not be reached through our existing structures.

Synod also welcomes with joy the appointment of the Rev Phil Wheeler as the new Director of Evangelism and New Churches and assures him of our prayerful support as he begins in the vital role of encouraging and supporting evangelism and the planting of new churches to reach the lost of Sydney.

(The Rev Archie Poulos 20/10/2015)

44/15 Biography of Sir Marcus Loane

Synod thanks Canon Allan Blanch for his newly published biography of Sir Marcus Loane, From Strength to Strength – a Life of Marcus Loane launched on the 14th October 2015.

Synod also encourages future biographical and historical work, which records and celebrates those whom God has used to help secure and develop the evangelical character of the Diocese.

(The Rev Peter Tong 20/10/2015)
45/15 Nomination process for electing the Archbishop

That Standing Committee consider bringing to Synod amendments to the *Archbishop of Sydney Election Ordinance 1982* to give effect to a provision that, once the minimum number of 20 nominations for a nominee is reached, no more nominators are required, and only the first 20 nominations for a nominee received by the Returning Officer will be made known to members of Synod.

(Dr Stuart Piggin 20/10/2015)

46/15 Implementation of the Diocesan policy for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour

Synod –

(a) determines that the Diocesan Policy for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour (the “policy”) commences on 1 January 2016 and that the existing Grievance Policy and Procedure for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour by clergy and church workers in parishes ceases on that date, and

(b) requests that a copy of the policy be circulated to all rectors and parish councils for their attention and that parishioners be made aware of the policy, and

(c) requests that the Regional Bishops be offered training to undertake their responsibilities under the policy, and

(d) requests that the Regional Bishops report annually to Standing Committee on such training received for their policy responsibilities and on their use (or otherwise) of the policy and model procedures, and

(e) authorises the Standing Committee to make amendments to the policy provided any amendments are reported to the next ordinary session of the Synod, and

(f) requests the Standing Committee to undertake a review of the policy after a period of 5 years from its commencement, and

(g) requests the committee appointed to review the *Discipline Ordinance 2006* to consider the relationship between the policy and the *Discipline Ordinance* and, in particular, to consider whether the *Offences Ordinance 1962* should be amended to include as an additional offence for clergy and other church workers “repeated and unreasonable behaviour directed towards a staff member or volunteer worker in a parish that creates a risk to the health or safety of that person”.

(Canon Sandy Grant 20/10/2015)

47/15 Syrian refugee crisis

This Synod, mindful of the scale of the humanitarian catastrophe in the wake of the violence in Syria and elsewhere in the Middle East, remembering the open handed generosity of Christ our Good Samaritan, and aware of the abundant resources with which our gracious God has endowed this nation –

(a) gives thanks to God for the leadership of Archbishop Glenn Davies on this issue both in public and in private, and particularly in mobilising the Diocese through its parishes and organisations to assist those in such dire need;

(b) commits itself to support him in prayer as he continues to play such an important role in our nation’s response to this crisis;

(c) commits itself and encourages all in this Diocese to continue to pray for the people of this war-torn region, especially those who suffer persecution for the name of Jesus;

(d) encourages all in the Diocese to seek to build personal helping relationships where possible;

(e) commends the Australian Government for agreeing to increase the number of refugees from this region;

(f) respectfully calls on the Australian Government to consider further significant increases to this number and the provision of a permanent safe-haven for the men, women and children who have suffered as result of civil war, terrorism and the policies of regimes and organisations in all parts of the world, including all those who have suffered persecution for their faith; and

(g) encourages all members of the Anglican Church in Sydney to enthusiastically and generously support the fundraising initiatives of Diocesan organisations that have committed assistance, expertise, resources and facilities towards the needs of the Syrian refugees.

(The Rev Dr Mark Thompson 20/10/2015)
48/15 Repentance and redress for child abuse

Synod acknowledges that the Anglican Diocese of Sydney –
(a) continues to publicly repent of and apologise for child abuse suffered within the institutions of the Diocese, and
(b) continues to engage with survivors as they come forward to offer redress that may include –
   (i) an acknowledgment of the abuse,
   (ii) financial assistance,
   (iii) provision of specific services including counselling, and
   (iv) a meaningful personal apology.

(The Rev Nigel Fortescue 20/10/2015)

49/15 Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2015

Synod defers further consideration of the bill for the Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2015 until the next session of Synod and requests the Standing Committee to –
(a) consult with the Chairs, Heads and Chaplains of Anglican schools in respect to a suitable form of the bill and any matters of principle identified in any proposed amendments to the text of the bill which have not been dealt with at this session,
(b) invite the Chairs, Heads and Chaplains to send any comments on the bill and matters of principle to the Diocesan Secretary by 31 March 2016, and
(c) make arrangements to resume consideration of the bill at the next session having regard to any comments that are received.

(Bishop Chris Edwards 20/10/2015)

50/15 Professional Pastoral Supervision for Clergy and Stipendiary Lay Ministers

Synod –
(a) recognises and gives thanks to God for the sacrificial and tireless efforts of our clergy and stipendiary lay ministers in parish ministry;
(b) notes the need for all clergy and stipendiary lay ministers to debrief in a safe, stable and suitable supervisory space;
(c) requests that the Standing Committee ask for a report from the Pastoral Supervision Working Group, and then review and report back to the Synod.

(The Rev Robin Kinstead 20/10/2015)

51/15 Career Transition Management for Clergy and Stipendiary Lay Ministers

Synod –
(a) recognises and gives thanks to God for the sacrificial and tireless efforts of our clergy and stipendiary lay ministers in parish ministry;
(b) requests that the Standing Committee establish a Working Group to explore ways of making it possible for those clergy and stipendiary lay ministers who need to transition from their parish ministry role to do so with honour and dignity, and report back to the Synod.

(The Rev Robin Kinstead 20/10/2015)

52/15 Large Receipts Policy

Synod requests Standing Committee to adhere to its Large Receipts Policy until such time as a proposal for a levy as an alternative to a LPRP is considered by Synod.

(The Rev Craig Roberts 20/10/2015)
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1. Introduction

1.1 Charter

The Standing Committee is constituted under the Standing Committee Ordinance 1897. Its duties arise under a number of ordinances and include the following –

(a) making arrangements for the meetings of the Synod and preparing the Synod’s business, and
(b) acting as a council of advice to the Archbishop (the “Archbishop-in-Council”), and
(c) considering and reporting upon matters referred to it by the Synod and carrying out the Synod’s resolutions, and
(d) deliberating and conferring upon all matters affecting the interests of the Church, and
(e) making ordinances under delegated powers, and
(f) preparing and administering parochial cost recoveries and Synod appropriations and allocations, and
(g) appointing persons to fill casual vacancies among persons elected by the Synod to boards etc, and
(h) monitoring the finances of diocesan organisations.

1.2 Access

Meetings are held in the Chapter House, St Andrew’s Cathedral. Mail should be addressed to “The Diocesan Secretary, Standing Committee of Synod, PO Box Q190, QVB Post Office NSW 1230” (telephone (02) 9265 1555; email rjw@sydney.anglican.asn.au). Office hours are 9 am to 5 pm.

A report on each meeting is published a few days after the meeting on the website of Sydney Diocesan Secretariat at www.sds.asn.au.

1.3 Meetings and members

Since October 2014 we have met 10 times. The names of the members will be listed in the 2014 Diocesan Year Book and on the website of Sydney Diocesan Secretariat at www.sds.asn.au.

During the year, the following changes took place in the membership of the Standing Committee –

- Dean Phillip Jensen ceased being a member ex-officio upon his retirement as the Dean of St Andrew’s Cathedral.
- A vacancy arose in the position of a lay person elected by the Western Sydney Region upon the resignation of Mrs Janette Thambryrajah. The regional electors of the Western Sydney Region elected Mrs Patricia Jackson to fill the vacancy.
- A vacancy arose in the position of a minister elected by the Georges River Region upon the resignation of the Rev Peter Lin. The regional electors of the Georges River Region elected the Rev Matthew Yeo to fill the vacancy.
- Bishop Peter Lin became a member ex-officio upon his appointment as the Bishop of the Georges River Region.

1.4 Management and structure

Each meeting of the Standing Committee is like a small Synod meeting. Our permanent subcommittees are –

- Affiliated Churches Committee
- Royal Commission Steering Committee
- Diocesan Resources Committee
- Service Review Committee
- Finance Committee
- Social Issues Committee
- General Synod Relations Committee
- Stipends and Allowances Committee
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Ordinance Reviewers and Panels  Strategic Research Group
Religious Freedom Reference Group  Work Outside the Diocese Committee

The terms of reference and the membership of our permanent subcommittees are posted at www.sds.asn.au.

Other committees are appointed from time to time for special tasks. We thank God for the faithfulness and expertise of the people who serve on our committees.

1.5 Acting Dean
Following the retirement of Dean Phillip Jensen in December 2014, we invited the Acting Dean, Canon Christopher Allan, to attend and speak, but not vote or move motions, at our meetings until the next Dean takes up office.

1.6 Appointment of the Rev Kanishka Raffel as the next Dean of Sydney
We warmly welcomed the appointment of the Rev Kanishka Raffel as the next Dean of Sydney and looked forward to joining us when he takes up this role.

1.7 Appointment of the Rev Philip Wheeler as the next Director of Evangelism and New Churches
We congratulated the Rev Philip Wheeler on his appointment as the next Director of Evangelism and New Churches and committed to pray for Philip and his wife as they transition to this new and strategic ministry.

1.8 Bishop Peter Tasker
We thanked Bishop Tasker for his service to the Standing Committee since he became a member in October 1993. We noted that he was due to retire as the Bishop of Liverpool in June 2004 but continued in this role until June 2009, and then continued in extensive episcopal and other functions at the request of Archbishops Jensen and Davies. We also noted that Bishop Tasker will continue as the Archbishop of Sydney's Bishop for International Relations, and gave thanks to God for his hard work and wise counsel over many years.

1.9 Death of Mr John Lambert AM
We noted with sadness the death of Mr John Lambert AM, and gave thanks to God for his life and ministry, particularly for his astounding efforts on behalf of Anglican schooling throughout this State. We expressed our condolences to John’s widow and his extended family.

1.10 Death of Bishop Barbara Darling
We noted with sadness the death of Bishop Barbara Darling, the first tenured female lecturer at Ridley College and in 2008 the first woman to be consecrated bishop in the Diocese of Melbourne.

1.11 Death of Sir Harold Knight KBE DSC
We noted with sadness the death of Sir Harold Knight KBE DSC who was a prominent lay contributor to the Diocese of Sydney, serving on the Standing Committee and as a Trustee of the Estate of the Late Thomas Moore.

1.12 Death of the Rev Stuart Abrahams
We noted with sadness the death of the Rev Stuart Abrahams who served as the Director for the Vision for Growth Appeal, the Director of the Archbishop’s Ministry and Support Appeals Unit and as the Chief Executive Officer of Anglican Youth and Education Diocese of Sydney. We sent our condolences to Stuart’s widow and other family members.

2. Actions with the Archbishop

2.1 Appointment of the Rev Dr Michael Stead as a new Assistant Bishop
Under clause 5 of the Assistant Bishops Ordinance 1947 we approved the appointment of the Rev Dr Michael Stead as an Assistant Bishop, to be the next Bishop of South Sydney to succeed Bishop Robert Forsyth upon his retirement at the end of 2015.

2.2 Estate of Late M.A. Grant (Sisters’ Endowment)
In December 2014 the Archbishop-in-Council appropriated $30,000 from this Estate for distribution by the Archbishop to assist clergy, clergy widows and clergy children or orphans who are in need. The Archbishop-in-Council appropriated a further $33,000 from this Estate in September 2015 for this purpose.
2.3 Parramatta ’54 Free Fund
The income of this fund is to be distributed among the objects of the Diocese of Sydney as determined by the Archbishop-in-Council. During the year the amounts of $2,052 and $4,984 were paid to the General Synod Office for the attendance and travel equalisation costs for 4 Sydney Bishops attending the March 2014 Australian Bishops’ Conference and 5 Sydney Bishops attending the March 2015 Conference respectively.

2.4 Parishes of Leichhardt and Canterbury with Hurlstone Park – right of nomination
The parishes of Leichhardt and Canterbury with Hurlstone Park became vacant during the year but the Archbishop was unable to declare that either parish had complied with clause 5 of the Nomination Ordinance 2006. Both matters were referred to the Archbishop-in-Council which determined that, in the circumstances, the parishes should not have the benefits under the Ordinance.

2.5 Archbishop’s Ordination Policy
We received a policy from the Archbishop regarding Ordination in the Diocese of Sydney. The document sets out the minimum qualifications for ordination to the Diaconate and the Presbyterate.

2.6 Declaration of Thomas Hassall Anglican College as extra-parochial
The Archbishop-in-Council, pursuant to clause 7(1) of the Schools Chapels and Chaplains Ordinance 1975, excluded Thomas Hassall Anglican College from the Parish of Hoxton Park and declared it extra-parochial.

2.7 Declaration of Shellharbour Anglican College as extra-parochial
The Archbishop-in-Council, pursuant to clause 7(1) of the Schools Chapels and Chaplains Ordinance 1975, excluded Shellharbour Anglican College from the Parish of Shellharbour City Centre and declared it extra-parochial.

3. Financial and Property Administration

3.1 Accounts, Audits and Annual Reports Ordinance 1995
Organisations of the Synod which manage church trust property must report annually to the Synod. These reports include information in relation to members, structure, activities and a summary of the financial results, together with audited financial statements, a liquidity report, a risk management report and a charities group status report. The reports must be lodged by 30 June each year. A later lodgement date has been approved for three organisations, Anglicare, Anglican Retirement Villages and Anglican Aid whose financial year ends on 30 June.

Some of these organisations are also required to provide us with certain internal management financial information during the year.

The annual reports and audited financial statements for about 40 organisations will be tabled in the Synod. Any major problems found by the Finance Committee from a review of these financial statements and the additional internal management financial information will be reported.

3.2 Annual Financial Statements for the Synod Funds and Parish Funds
The annual financial statements for the Amalgamated Synod Funds and Amalgamated Parish Funds have been prepared and reported on according to an agreed review of procedures instead of an audit.

These reports are printed separately.

3.3 Ordination training fund
In 2014 this Fund received a Synod allocation of $40,000 (2013 $40,000) which it used to provide a book allowance of $1,000 to first year candidates studying through Moore Theological College or Youthworks College for ordination in Sydney, and to meet a number of specific costs associated with preparing candidates for ordination. In exceptional cases the Fund may also provide bursaries or financial assistance to some of the students.

3.4 Ordinances
The following table shows the number of ordinances passed and assented to in 2009 to 2014 and in 2015 up to 18 September 2015 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synod</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A separate report lists the ordinances passed by us since the 2014 session of the Synod. There are
11 ordinances of particular interest.

The *Professional Standards Unit (Funding) Ordinance 2014* provided funding to meet the cost of an unexpected increase in the non-standard expenses of the Professional Standards Unit in 2014 and further funding to support Safe Ministry in parishes during 2015.

The *Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 (Safe Ministry) Amendment Ordinance 2015* provided for compliance with Working with Children Check and Safe Ministry Training requirements in parishes.

The *Synod Estimates Ordinance 1998 Amendment Ordinance 2015* provided for the Synod to give its approval, or otherwise determine, regarding the statements of funding principles and priorities prepared for the first ordinary session of each Synod.

The *Professional Standards Unit (Funding) Ordinance 2015* provided funding to meet the cost of an unexpected increase in the non-standard expenses of the Professional Standards Unit in 2015.

The *Synod (Governance of Diocesan Organisations) Amendment Ordinance 2015* modified the reporting and elections processes of the Synod in accordance with the Synod’s Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations and for related purposes.

The *Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation Ordinance 1947 Amendment Ordinance 2014* provided, among other things, that the Corporation is solely responsible for all liabilities incurred by it or on its behalf other than where another person or entity has agreed to be responsible for the liability.

The *Endowment of the See (Pyrmont) Land Sale Ordinance 2014* authorised the sale of a residence at Pyrmont and the application of the proceeds of the sale towards the purchase of a residence or residences to house such senior clergy of the Diocese as the Archbishop may determine.

The *St Andrew’s House Trust Ordinance 2015* re-declared the trusts of the property held in the trust fund known as the St Andrew’s House Trust, in order to allow the transition of the role of trustee of St Andrew’s House Trust from the Glebe Administration Board to the St Andrew’s House Corporation. See item 3.20.

The *Synod (General Synod Assessment) Special Application Ordinance 2015* varied the trusts on which certain property of the Synod is held to enable the payment of a budgeted shortfall in the amount of the General Synod assessment in 2015. See item 6.4.

The *Parish Administration (Registers) Amendment Ordinance 2015* made provision for the management and control of church and congregation registers and records.

The *Cost Recoveries Framework Ordinance 2008 Amendment Ordinance 2015* clarified the calculation of gross operating receipts and provided for certain residential lease income to be excluded from the calculation of net operating receipts.

See item 3.21.

### 3.5 Parochial cost recoveries - arrears

The following table compares the arrears of cost recovery charges as at 30 June 2015 and 2014 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabramatta</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Hill with Sefton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmore Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenacre</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>4,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby Anglican Chinese Church</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouse Hill</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Clair</td>
<td>6,450</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,539</strong></td>
<td><strong>64,518</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 Remission of PCR charges

In accordance with clause 8(3) of the *Cost Recoveries Framework Ordinance 2008*, we agreed to remit $33,428 of the variable PCR charge and $14,525 of the land acquisition levy being amounts that would otherwise be payable by the parish of Longueville in 2015 due to the receipt of a bequest. We did so because there was material indicating a desire that the bequest be used to replace the rectory.
3.7 Annual financial statements from parishes

Under the *Parish Administration Ordinance 2008*, parochial units are required to lodge their audited financial statements within 7 days after their annual general meeting of parishioners.

As at 30 April 2015, 95 parochial units (35%) had not lodged a set of prescribed financial statements (compared with 81 at the same time in 2014). By 9 July 2015 this had improved so that only 4 parochial units had not lodged their financial statements, although 9 other parochial units had only lodged unsigned financial statements.

The Finance Committee has processes in place to remind parochial units of their obligations under the Ordinance, assist with any enquiries and review the statements lodged. The Finance Committee also works with the Regional Bishops to investigate and report to us on the status of the audited financial statements for parochial units that are late in lodging the required information.

3.8 Local revenues test for parish status

The parishes of Auburn, Balmain, Bankstown, Coogee, Enmore/Stanmore, Kingsford, Mulgoa, Mt Druitt and Watsons Bay had local revenue below the requisite amount in 2014 and accordingly these parishes have been advised of the importance of ensuring their 2015 and future revenues meet the relevant threshold figures in order to retain their parish status.

3.9 Recommended distribution from the Diocesan Endowment for 2015

We noted the advice of Glebe Administration Board that, for the purposes of clause 5(1) of the *Diocesan Endowment Ordinance 1984*, $4.3 million could prudently be distributed from the Diocesan Endowment in 2015 for spending by the Synod in 2016.

3.10 Synod Appropriations and Allocations for 2016-2018

Under clause 3 of the *Synod Estimates Ordinance 1998* we are required to prepare for the 2nd ordinary session of the 50th Synod a proposed ordinance which contains estimates for 2016, 2017 and 2018 of –

- the amount required for meeting the cost of sittings of the Synod, the maintenance of diocesan offices and the expenses of such other diocesan activities and commitments as, in our opinion, should be supported, and
- the amount which, in our opinion, should be granted to organisations under the control of Synod or to other organisations, and
- the amount of income available from endowments or other trusts for meeting the amounts referred to above in the relevant financial year.

A bill for the *Synod Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance 2015* and explanatory report is printed separately.

3.11 Parochial cost recoveries for 2016-2018

Under clause 5 of the *Cost Recoveries Framework Ordinance 2008*, we are required to prepare for the 2nd ordinary session of the 50th Synod an ordinance which specifies the cost recoveries charge in respect of ministry costs and parochial network costs to be paid by each parochial unit in 2016, 2017 and 2018.

A bill for the *Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2015* and an explanatory report is printed separately.

3.12 Stipends, allowances and benefits for 2016

A report on stipends, allowances and benefits for 2016 is printed separately.

3.13 Work Outside the Diocese

In the 6 months to 30 June 2015, the Work Outside the Diocese Committee had applied $182,477 from a total Synod allocation in 2015 of $201,000. It is expected that further amounts will be applied during the 6 months to 31 December 2015 from the 2015 allocation, and the reserves of $102,487.

3.14 Gilbulla Memorial Conference Centre Sale Ordinance 2001

We noted that the remaining funds in the Gilbulla Fund were used by Anglican Youthworks to purchase a new conference centre at 92 Wattle Tree Road, Holgate comprising a two storey residence set on 2.5 acres.

3.15 Sale of Bishopscourt

The *Bishopscourt Sale Ordinance 2012* authorised the sale of Bishopscourt at any time within 5 years after the date of assent to the Ordinance, at such a price as we (acting on the recommendation of the Property Trust) approve by resolution.

During the course of the year we received regular updates from the Property Trust regarding the sale process.
3.16 **Collective insurance buying for diocesan schools and organisations**

We encouraged Diocesan schools and organisations who currently do not participate in the Church Insurance Program to consider opportunities to harness economies of scale through aggregating their individual insurances with “like” organisations.

3.17 **Finance Committee terms of reference and sub-delegations**

We amended the Finance Committee’s terms of reference to specify the criteria to be considered when certain standard form parish trust ordinances reach their review date. We also approved specified sub-delegations proposed by the Finance Committee.

3.18 **General Synod Relations Committee terms of reference and sub-delegations**

We amended the General Synod Relations Committee’s terms of reference and approved a sub-delegation of the powers of the General Synod Relations Committee. These changes were made in order to allow an appropriate level of accountability regarding Synod Fund 130, which is used for accommodation and related costs in attending sessions of the General Synod.

3.19 **Royal Commission Steering Committee terms of reference**

We revised the terms of reference for the Royal Commission Steering Committee (“RCSC”). The changes made more explicit the capacity of the RCSC to make certain submissions on our behalf and to make recommendations to us on significant matters of diocesan policy arising from the Royal Commission.

See also item 5.2.

3.20 **Appointment of St Andrew’s House Corporation as trustee of St Andrew’s House Trust**

We noted the resignation of Glebe Administration Board (“GAB”) as trustee of the St Andrew’s House Trust and elected St Andrew’s House Corporation as the trustee of the Trust in the place of GAB.

3.21 **But-Har-Gra**

The property at Croydon known as “But-Har-Gra” is held on trust by the Moore Theological College Council solely for such charitable purposes for and in connection with the Diocese as determined from time to time by the Archbishop and the Standing Committee. Under these trusts, Moore College has been given the management and control of But-Har-Gra since 1956.

We passed an ordinance to vary the trusts of the property so that it would be held on trust for the purposes of the Council of the College. However the Archbishop declined to assent to the ordinance as he was not satisfied that the possible use of part of the property for a residence of the Bishop of South Sydney had been adequately considered.

3.22 **Mission Property Committee**

During the year, the Mission Property Committee informed us that it had acquired a strategically located new church site at Marsden Park. It also advised us that the new Oran Park ministry centre was officially opened on 2 May 2015.

A report about these matters is printed separately.

4. **General Administration**

4.1 **Elections**

The appointment of persons to serve on committees etc. continued to be a major part of our business. Some appointments are to fill casual vacancies among Synod appointees, while others are made by the Standing Committee in its own right.

From November 2014 to July 2015, 171 such positions were filled (86 for the same period in 2013 – 2014).

4.2 **Election of members to diocesan boards and councils by the Synod or the Standing Committee**

We modified our policy with regard to elections to require that any member who nominates a person for election to the board or council of a diocesan organisation which is a body corporate must certify that the person is willing to sign a “Statement of personal faith”, and if elected to such board or council, will do so before attending any meeting of the board or council.

4.3 **Guidelines for effective use of soft-copy agendas**

We noted Guidelines for the effective use of soft-copy agendas, and encouraged members to review these Guidelines and to consider transitioning to the use of soft-copy agendas if they have not already done so.
4.4 Reports from Regional Councils
Under clause 9 of the Regions Ordinance 1995 each regional council must give us an annual report for inclusion in our report to the Synod. The annual reports are printed separately, together with any reports for reclassification of provisional parishes under the Parishes Ordinance 1979.

4.5 Affiliated Churches
We declared Mackay Evangelical Church, Queensland to be affiliated with the Diocese under the Affiliated Churches Ordinance 2005.

4.6 Review of the services of Sydney Diocesan Secretariat to the Synod and Standing Committee
We undertook a review of the services provided by the Sydney Diocesan Secretariat (“SDS”) during 2014 and confirmed that the services had been provided in a satisfactory manner. We agreed the revised form of the service level standards to be provided by SDS in 2015 and reviewed the services under the revised standards during the first 4 months of 2015. Those services will be reviewed again later in 2015.

4.7 Governance Oversight Committee
Last year we agreed to place the Governance Oversight Committee into abeyance until its role could be redefined in accordance with any Synod approved Governance Policy of Diocesan Organisations. The Synod approved the Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations (the “Policy”) at its session in 2014. Having determined the immediate steps required to implement the Policy, we deferred further consideration of any reconstituted Governance Committee to oversee the implementation of the Policy and dissolved the current Governance Oversight Committee.

4.8 Review of Safe Ministry Board Ordinance 2001
We appointed a committee to review the Safe Ministry Ordinance 2001. We have not yet received the committee’s recommendations about this matter.

4.9 Licensing of Lay Ministry
We asked the Ordinance Reform Group to prepare a draft ordinance with recommended changes to revise or replace the Deaconesses, Readers and Other Lay Persons Ordinance 1981. A bill for the Authorisation of Lay Ministry Ordinance 2015 and an explanatory report for the bill are printed separately.

4.10 Reconstitution of the New South Wales Council of Churches
We expressed our support for a proposed reconstitution of the New South Wales Council of Churches (“NSWCC”) and requested that an annual amount of $15,000 (+ inflation) for NSWCC membership fees be included in the Synod’s budget for the 2016-2018 triennium. In light of the likely changes to membership requirements resulting from the proposed reconstitution, we decided not to conduct elections to fill vacancies in the office of diocesan representatives on the NSWCC at the 2015 session of Synod.

4.11 Parental leave for clergy
We appointed a committee to bring us a proposal for parental leave for parish clergy in consultation with the Archbishop. A report about this matter is printed separately.

4.12 Guidelines for Remuneration of Parish Ministry Staff in 2016
We approved guidelines for the remuneration of parish ministry staff in 2016 reflecting a 4% increase in recommended minimum stipend.

4.13 Amendments to the Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations
We amended the Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations to discontinue, as a matter of policy, our involvement in the setting of borrowing limits for diocesan organisations and to clarify the liabilities for which diocesan organisations should offer their property as security. The amendments made to the Policy Guidelines in Appendix 2 are as follows –

“34. The diocesan organisation should not offer its property as security for any liability other than a liability of the diocesan organisation or a body controlled by the diocesan organisation.

34.35. Any mortgage, charge, debenture or other negotiable instrument given by the diocesan organisation over its property vested in or held by it (other than a cheque drawn on a bank account held by the diocesan organisation) should include a provision limiting the liability of the diocesan organisation to the amount available to be paid in the event it is wound up.

35. The borrowing limit of the diocesan organisation should be specified and any increase
We also amended paragraph 2 of the Statement of Personal Faith in Appendix 3 of the Policy as follows –

"2. In particular I believe –
   (a) that God's word written, the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the supreme authority in all matters of faith and conduct;
   (b) that there is only one way to be reconciled to God which is through his Son, Jesus Christ, who died for our sins and was raised for our justification; and
   (c) that we are justified before God by faith only."

4.14 Study into effective church planting

We noted a study into effective church planting commissioned by the Strategic Research Group and requested that a motion reflecting the recommendations from the study be moved at Synod.

We also requested that a method of maintaining a register of church plants be implemented and that best practice guidelines for church planting based on the findings of the study be circulated to parishes.

A copy of the study has been distributed to Synod members.

4.15 Amendments to the Synod and Standing Committee membership

We requested that a bill be promoted to the Synod to make changes to the qualifications and entitlements of certain members of the Synod and the Standing Committee and to improve the administration of Synod's membership.

A bill for the Synod and Standing Committee (Membership) Amendment Ordinance 2015 and explanatory report for the bill are printed separately.

4.16 Filing of incorporation ordinances

We established a committee to oversight research to confirm that all requisite documentation relating to incorporation of diocesan bodies under the Anglican Church of Australia (Bodies Corporate) Act 1938 has been certified and filed in accordance with that Act.

4.17 Amendments to the Retirements Ordinance 1993

We requested that a bill be promoted to the Synod which ensures that the provisions in the Retirements Ordinance 1993 for licensing clergy after the retirement age conforms with the requirements of clause 3(4) of the 1902 Constitutions.

A bill for the Retirements Ordinance 1993 Amendment Ordinance 2015 and explanatory report for the bill are printed separately.

5. Relations with Government

5.1 Social Issues Committee

The Social Issues Committee (SIC) comprises the following members –

Dr Karin Sowada (Chair)          The Rev Dr David Höhne
Dr Megan Best                  The Rev Dr Michael Jensen
Canon Sandy Grant                Mr Darren Mitchell
The Rev Dr Andrew Ford        Dr Sumithra Muthayya

The SIC provides advice to the Archbishop on issues which are referred to it by him. It also provides advice on issues referred to it by the Standing Committee, or at the request of the Synod. When resources allow, the SIC also identifies and initiates the study and discussion of social issues and matters of public policy among Anglicans in the Diocese, and interacts with Government and other external organisations through submissions to parliamentary and public inquiries. The SIC is also often the first point of contact for community groups and other organisations wishing to engage with the Diocese on matters of public policy.

Since the last Synod, the SIC has met 9 times, and has been involved in a range of matters, including –

(a) providing a written submission to Free TV Australia and associated correspondence with the Federal Minister for Communications, regarding proposed revisions to the Commercial TV Industry Code of Practice,

(b) providing advice and recommendations regarding the issue of divestment of investments in fossil fuel and gambling industries as part of the review of the GAB and ACPT Ethical Investment Policy (see item 7.9A),
(c) responding to Synod’s request (Resolution 16/14) for guidance as to the appropriateness of allowing yoga and similar activities to take place on church property (see item 7.8),

(d) monitoring issues around proposals to redefine marriage and making available resources for Anglican stakeholders through the SIC web site,

(e) assisted the Archbishop in providing a written submission to the Federal Government’s Competition Policy Review concerning the de-regulation of retail trading hours on public holidays such as Christmas and Good Friday,

(f) monitoring developments in the euthanasia debate around the country,

(g) promoting ‘Freedom Sunday’ on Sunday 18 October in Anglican parishes and at the Synod, to highlight the scourge of human trafficking and slavery, and

(h) upgrading the resources available on the SIC web site.

The SIC continues to monitor other issues, including domestic and family violence, asylum seeker policies and children in detention, constitutional recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, social housing, problem gambling, media regulation, and filtering of Internet Service Providers.

For reports, submissions and briefings on current and archived matters, please refer to SIC’s web site [http://www.sie.org.au/](http://www.sie.org.au/).

5.2 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse

On 12 November 2012, the then Prime Minister announced that she would be recommending to the Governor-General the establishment of a Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Australia. The Royal Commission was subsequently established by letters patent.

A report about the progress of the response of the Diocese to the Royal Commission is printed separately.

We subsequently noted that the Royal Commission released its report and recommendations on Redress and Civil Litigation. We are still considering this report.

5.3 Human Sexuality and the Same Sex Marriage Debate

We requested that Anglican Media, in consultation with the Chairman of the Diocesan Doctrine Commission, coordinate the communication of the Doctrine Commission’s report on Human Sexuality in a variety of media, including –

(a) the publication of the report on a dedicated and publicly accessible page on SDS’s website,

(b) the publication of a condensed version of the report in the Southern Cross,

(c) the publication by Anglican Youthworks of 1,000 copies of the report in booklet form to be provided to rectors in the Diocese, members and Senators of the Australian Parliament, as well as other Christian leaders and decision-makers, and

(d) the preparation and dissemination by Anglican Media of material conveying the key elements of the report to broader audiences.

The report is available on Diocesan Doctrine Commission page of the SDS website, in the ‘Synod and Standing Committee section’, under the ‘Reports and Resources’ menu.

We requested that a motion be moved at the Synod affirming marriage as between a man and a woman.

5.4 Working with Children Check

We noted that in August last year the Archbishop was advised by the Office of the Children’s Guardian (“OCG”) that it was auditing compliance with Working with Children Check requirements in relation to all licensed clergy in the Diocese.

In response, requisite information for 1,107 clergy and additional information about parishes and organisations in the Diocese was provided to the OCG. Following resolution of some minor discrepancies, the OCG advised that no further action or information was required.

We thanked all those who were involved in processing the Working with Children Check numbers and the audit.

5.5 Christian Youth Camps v Cobaw Community Health Service

Last year we reported about a decision of the Victorian Court of Appeal in the matter of *Christian Youth Camps Limited v Cobaw Community Health Services Limited*. The decision concerned Christian Youth Camp’s refusal to allow Cobaw to hire a camping resort connected to the Christian Brethren denomination for the purposes of a weekend to provide support and suicide prevention seminars to same sex attracted young people. The Court upheld the earlier decision of the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal that
the refusal amounted to unlawful discrimination on the basis of the sexual orientation of those who would be attending the camp.

The High Court subsequently heard and refused an application to grant special leave to appeal the Court of Appeal’s decision. The main basis for the refusal was that the case involved an issue of statutory interpretation of the repealed *Equal Opportunity Act 1995* (Vic), which had later being replaced by the *Equal Opportunity Act 2010* (Vic). The implication was that, since the statute has now been repealed, it was no longer appropriate to spend Court time considering its proper interpretation.

### 5.6 Special Religious Education

We received reports about the action being taken by Anglican Youthworks and the Anglican Education Commission in response to a directive of the Department of Education and Communities that 2 books forming part of the Anglican curriculum for Special Religious Education (“SRE”) not be used in State schools. The directive was subsequently reversed. However there remains a number of outstanding issues that need to be resolved as a consequence of the directive.

We noted the establishment of the Archbishop’s SRE Task Force and requested that consideration be given to the anticipated level of financial resources that may be needed to protect the delivery of SRE in the Diocese.

We requested that a motion be moved at the Synod about these matters.

We are also considering with the Anglican Education Commission the possible impact of the proposed changes to Special Religious Instruction in Victoria on the delivery of SRE in New South Wales.

See item 7.4.

### 6. The International, National and Provincial Church

#### 6.1 Diocese of Bathurst

Last year we reported about the serious financial difficulties of the Bathurst Diocese Anglican Development Fund. In particular we noted the inability of the Fund to meet its loan obligations to the Commonwealth Bank of Australia and that legal proceedings had been commenced against the former directors of the Fund, the Bathurst Property Trust and the Bathurst Bishop-in-Council for the repayment of the loan.

A group convened by the Chancellor has been monitoring these legal proceedings in the Supreme Court of New South Wales and will consider any implications arising from the decision of the Court which is expected after the forthcoming session of Synod.

In the meantime we encouraged the Archbishop to continue to walk in fellowship with the Bishop of Bathurst.

#### 6.2 Viability and Structures of the Anglican Church of Australia

See item 7.13.

#### 6.3 Long Service Leave Levy

The *General Synod Long Service Leave Canon 2010* includes an increase in the Long Service Leave (“LSL”) entitlement for clergy from 10 to 13 weeks after ten years’ service. It was anticipated that this increased entitlement would be funded through excess funds held by the Long Service Leave Fund. However these excess funds are no longer available.

Accordingly, the Long Service Leave levy is expected to be increased in 2015 and 2016.

We conveyed to the General Secretary our concern regarding these changes and the resulting increased financial impact this will have on individual parishes around Australia. We requested that the General Secretary consider the action that might be taken to address this issue including reverting to the original 10 week entitlement, given the changed circumstances of the LSL.

#### 6.4 General Synod assessment for 2015

We passed the *Synod (General Synod Assessment) Special Application Ordinance 2015* to meet a shortfall of $33,000 in budgeted funding to meet the 2015 General Synod statutory amount of $465,236. The shortfall arose due to various funding decisions made at the General Synod session not being taken into account in the preparation of our budget.

#### 6.5 General Synod Financial Risk Officer

We were informed that in November the General Synod’s Standing Committee agreed in principle to the appointment of a Financial Risk Officer in the General Synod Office. We acknowledged the shared reputational risk associated with the financial failure of any diocese but suggested that –
• the greatest benefit for such a role would be working with the nine or so dioceses identified by
  the General Synod Financial Advisory Task Force as being at greatest financial risk, and
• the effectiveness of the role should be tested by asking each of those dioceses whether they
  would be willing to participate in a detailed financial review led by a Financial Risk Officer.

6.6 Hosting the 17th session of General Synod
We decided not to submit a tender to host the 17th session of the General Synod. We also conveyed to the
General Secretary the recommendation that sessions of the General Synod revert to being held every four
years rather than every three.

6.7 Model Episcopal Standards Ordinance
During the year the General Secretary circulated a Model Episcopal Standards Ordinance to each diocese
for consideration and potential adoption. We referred the Model Ordinance to our General Synod Relations
Committee with the request that it make recommendations about this matter in due course.

6.8 GAFCON Primates meeting
We noted the communiqué signed by the GAFCON Primates following their meeting in London in April.
We also noted that the Archbishop attended this meeting at the invitation of the Primates.

6.9 Episcopal appointments in the Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn
We congratulated Archdeacon Matt Brain on his appointment as assistant Bishop in the Diocese of
Canberra and Goulburn and Bishop Trevor Edwards on his appointment as bishop responsible for ministry
development in the western and coastal regions of the diocese. We extended our prayerful best wishes to
them both as they commence in these roles.

6.10 Constitutional definition of “Diocesan Council”
We requested that a bill be promoted to the Synod to assent to the Constitution Amendment (Diocesan
Council) Canon 2010. The Canon amends the definition of “Diocesan Council” in the Constitution of the
Anglican Church of Australia.

The bill and explanatory statement for the bill are printed separately.

7. Sydney Synod Matters

7.1 Large Property Receipts Policy
In response to Synod’s request at its session last year, we reviewed the Large Property Receipts Policy in
consultation with parishes and have prepared a revised policy for consideration by the Synod this year.
A report about this matter is printed separately.

7.2 17/07 Climate change
By resolution 17/07, the Synod accepted the emerging scientific consensus that climate change is occurring
and supported the need for Christian responses to the potential problems and opportunities that arise from
climate change including –
(a) praying for our world and using every opportunity to speak of the Lordship of Jesus Christ,
(b) Christian ministry to those most vulnerable to the effects of climate change such as farmers,
rural communities, the homeless and refugees,
(c) the setting of a godly example of good stewardship in our personal and communal lives,
(d) education of our children about a biblical understanding of creation and our role as its stewards
and carers,
(e) the development and implementation of an environmental policy within each Parish and
Diocesan organisation which expresses principles of good environmental stewardship and
care, and
(f) encouraging governments at all levels to take climate change seriously and to make wise
policy decisions to deal with its effects.

In 2008, we reported on responses to resolution 17/07 from the Property Trust and the Sydney Diocesan
Secretariat.

This year we received a report about the steps being taken to reduce the environmental impact of St
Andrew’s House, including the receipt of a formal 5.0 star energy rating under the National Australian Built
Environment Rating System (“NABERS”).
A report about this matter is printed separately.
7.3 35/09 Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee
The Synod constituted the Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee by resolution 35/09. During the year, TEMOC reviewed its constituting resolution in light of the Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations.
We requested a motion amending TEMOC’s constituting resolution as a result of the review be promoted to the Synod.

7.4 40/10 Implementation of the Grievance Policy and Procedure
By resolution 40/10, the Synod requested that we undertake a review of the Grievance Policy and Procedure passed by the Synod in October 2010.
A report about this matter and revised policy are printed separately.

7.5 41/10 Amendments to the Anglican Church of Australia Trust Property Act 1917
By resolution 41/10, the Synod requested a number of amendments to the Anglican Church of Australia Trust Property Act 1917 concerning various governance matters relevant to the proper functioning of the Property Trust.
During the year we were informed that the Diocese of Bathurst was not in a position to support any amendments to the Anglican Church of Australia Trust Property Act 1917 for the time being. We were also informed that the Diocese of Newcastle may have renewed reservations about accepting one of the amendments proposed in resolution 41/10, namely the capacity for the bishop of a diocese to remove himself as an ex officio member of the corporate trustee.
We are therefore not in a position to have an amending bill promoted to the NSW Parliament in the foreseeable future. However the matter will be reviewed next year.

7.6 14/12 Special Religious Education
By resolution 14/12, the Synod –
(a) affirmed its commitment to the sustaining of high quality Special Religious Education ("SRE") within all Government primary schools within the Diocese, and
(b) requested the Standing Committee to address the need for sufficient funds for this ministry in its 2014-2015 budget.
For the purposes of releasing the previously committed $200,000 to support the financial cost of the SRE Office in 2015, we declared our satisfaction with the structure and responsibilities of the “SRE Office” established within Youthworks. We also –
(a) endorsed the appointment of a full-time Director of Curriculum and a full-time Director of Quality Assurance in the SRE Office if sufficient Synod funds are made available to Youthworks in 2016, and
(b) noted that in 2015 Youthworks will have Synod funding for a part-time Director of Curriculum and a part-time Director of Quality Assurance once the $200,000 grant to support the financial cost of the SRE Office has been released, and
(c) agreed to consider an additional $125,000 in the 2015 Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance so as to enable Youthworks to appoint a full-time Director of Curriculum and a full-time Director of Quality Assurance for 2016.
A report about Synod funding for the triennium 2016 – 2018, including amounts allocated for the SRE Office, is printed separately.
During the year we completed an audit of Anglican SRE in Government Primary Schools in the Diocese. As a result of the audit we requested that the following action be taken to ensure that high quality SRE is sustained.
Firstly, we requested that each parish, with Anglican Youthworks’ support and encouragement, undertake a thorough analysis of its current SRE ministry with a view to recognising where its strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies and greatest challenges lie, and then develop a comprehensive plan for future recruitment, training, mentoring, partnership and community building.
Secondly, we requested that the Anglican Education Commission discuss with other SRE providers and the Department of Education and Communities the pros and cons of establishing a maximum class size for Primary SRE classes and the Department’s willingness, if an agreed class size is deemed appropriate, to enforce it just as it has done for Special Education in Ethics classes.
Thirdly, we requested that the Archbishop consider the practice of some Anglican SRE teachers in not using the authorised curriculum and the implications this could have for Diocesan compliance with Departmental requirements.

Finally, we requested that in establishing a new Office for SRE, Anglican Youthworks develop relevant training modules where required in respect to –

(a) the maintenance of accurate and up to date data relating to the delivery of SRE,
(b) the need for churches to recruit and train a significant number of experienced voluntary mentors who can support, observe and encourage other SRE teachers on a regular basis,
(c) the need for churches to work at growing their partnership with local schools and education stakeholders in their local community,
(d) the need to acquaint SRE teachers with Departmental policies and practices in respect to quality teaching and learning,
(e) the need for additional assistance to be given to SRE teachers who are experiencing difficulty with classroom management,
(f) the need to ensure that Work Health and Safety requirements are being met in every situation in which SRE teachers authorised by the Anglican Church are teaching,
(g) the efficacy of the Anglican Church sustaining SRE lessons within schools where there appears to be an inability to eliminate persistent rudeness and disruptiveness within the classroom, and
(h) to include educational technology training as part of the ongoing SRE teacher training.

7.7 33/13 Domestic violence and educating clergy

By resolution 33/13, the Synod requested Moore College and Ministry Training and Development, in consultation with the Safe Ministry Board and appropriate experts as required, to review the input they already provide to the education of ordinands and clergy in regards to responding to domestic violence in marriage (and other relationships). Synod requested that Moore College and Ministry Training and Development report back with a progress report by the next session of Synod.

Progress reports from Moore Theological College and Ministry Training and Development are printed separately.

We also appointed a Task Force to further develop a diocesan response to domestic violence. We stipulated that the Task Force must consult with domestic violence victims or their representatives and with the Diocesan Doctrine Commission, Moore Theological College and Ministry, Training and Development; and that the Task Force should consider the following matters and report back to us with recommendations regarding –

(a) the development, adoption and communication of a diocesan domestic violence policy statement, along with advice for good pastoral practice,
(b) the facilitation of education of lay membership of our churches on the issue (eg via preparation of suitable resources),
(c) the education of our youth in regards to the recognition and prevention of domestic violence, and
(d) the encouragement of further developments in our education of clergy and church workers in this area (eg recognising warning signs in marriage preparation).

The Task Force is expected to commence its work shortly.

7.8 2/14 Review of School Chapels and Chaplains Ordinance 1975

By resolution 2/14, the Synod requested that we consult with Chaplains and Heads of Diocesan Schools in respect to an exposure draft of a bill provided to the Synod in 2014 and bring an ordinance to the 2015 session of Synod having regard to any comments received.

A bill for the Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2015 and an explanatory statement for the bill are printed separately.

7.9 7/14 Doctrine Commission report on fellowship meals for the proclamation of the Lord’s death

By resolution 7/14, the Synod –

(a) recorded its appreciation of the conscientious and diligent manner in which the members of the Standing Committee carry out their responsibilities on behalf of the Synod,
(b) respectfully requested Standing Committee to forward to the Synod any report requested by the Synod of a committee or a commission, without seeking to have that report altered by that
committee or commission, where that committee or commission is not required to have that report referred to Standing Committee for its consideration other than for distribution,

(c) thanked the members of the Doctrine Commission for its report to the Synod in response to Synod resolution 38/07, concerning fellowship meals for the proclamation of the Lord’s Death, tabled and discussed at the meeting of the Standing Committee on February 25, 2013,

(d) noted that the Standing Committee having thanked the Doctrine Commission for its work on that report then requested “that the Doctrine Commission reconsider the report in the light of any comments received from members of the Standing Committee”, and

(e) respectfully requested Standing Committee to forward to the Synod at its earliest convenience the original report.

The report of the Doctrine Commission is printed separately.

7.10 16/14 Yoga and other such activities

By resolution 16/14 the Synod –

(a) noted that in multi-cultural Australia there are many activities available for public participation which are based on, or derived from, Eastern religious practices and beliefs, including yoga, tai chi, some martial arts, and dragon boating,

(b) noted that some of our Diocesan churches and organisations offer such activities or allow them to be held on their premises,

(c) noted that some Christians believe such activities are contrary to the gospel, and lead those involved in them to inadvertently worship idols and false gods, and access evil spiritual forces; and accordingly, and

(d) requested the Social Issues Committee of the Diocese to report back to the next Session of Synod as to whether such activities are inconsistent with the gospel, and if so, should not be offered by our churches or Diocesan organisations, or allowed to be held on their premises.

A report about this matter is printed separately.

7.11 19/14 Providing pastoral care to people attracted to others of the same sex

By resolution 19/14, the Synod requested that the Standing Committee establish a committee of lay and clergy representatives to bring recommendations to the 2015 session of Synod on ways of providing pastoral care to people attracted to others of the same sex.

The committee we appointed has undertaken work in relation to this matter which we expect will be finalised for Synod in 2016.

7.12 22/14 Problem gambling in NSW

By resolution 22/14, the Synod welcomed the report of the NSW Legislative Council’s Select Committee on the Impact of Gambling published in August 2014 and grieved that NSW has above-average expenditure on gambling on a per capita basis compared to national averages. The Synod also called on Sydney Anglican organisations to divest themselves of any investments in any company whose revenue from gambling exceeds either 10% of revenue or $50 million per annum by 31 December 2014 or report to the Synod the mission imperatives of owning shares in gambling companies.

A report concerning a review of the Glebe Administration Board’s ethical investment policy is printed separately.

7.13 29/14 Sydney Diocesan Doctrine Commission membership and reports

By resolution 29/14, the Synod requested that the membership of the Sydney Diocesan Doctrine Commission be posted on the Diocesan website, and links to the full texts of the Commission’s reports since the year 2000 be provided at the same web location.

The Doctrine Commission’s membership and reports have been posted on SDS’s website www.sds.asn.au under “For Synod and Standing Committee” and then “Reports and Resources”.

7.14 30/14 Church Land Acquisitions Levy

By resolution 30/14, the Synod requested that the Standing Committee provide to the 2015 Synod session a report of the mid and long term views of the need for the Mission Property Committee (MPC) “Church Land Acquisitions Levy”. Synod requested that this report should also outline possible future strategies for raising these funds from parishes and other sources so that parishes may be informed of expected financial commitments for mid and long term planning purposes.

A report about this matter is printed separately.
7.15 31/14 Retention of marriage licences and same-sex marriage

By resolution 31/14, the Synod requested us to establish a working party to consider the wisdom of clergy keeping their marriage licences if same-sex marriage becomes a reality.

A report about this matter is printed separately.

7.16 33/14 Ministry progress and brownfields’ grants

By resolution 33/14, the Synod requested that we report on the conclusions that can be drawn from statistics in relation to brownfields churches which received grants funded from the Diocesan Endowment.

A report about this matter is printed separately.

7.17 36/14 Further review of the Discipline Ordinance 2006

By resolution 36/14, the Synod requested the Standing Committee to appoint a committee consisting of three lay persons and three members of the clergy together with a person to be appointed by the Archbishop with the following terms of reference –

(a) to review the Discipline Ordinance 2006 and related disciplinary ordinances,
(b) to consult with the other Dioceses in the Province with a view to exploring the feasibility of a uniform disciplinary regime in the Province,
(c) to bring a report and any proposed amending or replacement ordinance or ordinances to the 2nd ordinary session of the 50th Synod.

We appointed a committee to review the Discipline Ordinance 2006. However, a key member of the committee was unavailable to participate in the review process. As such, we agreed that the report and ordinances be brought for consideration at the 3rd ordinary session of the 50th Synod in 2016.

7.18 47/14 Report of the Viability and Structures Task Force

By resolution 47/14, the Synod noted –

(i) the Report of the Viability and Structures Task Force (the “Viability Report”) considered at the 2014 session of General Synod, and
(ii) the response of the General Synod to the Viability Report in resolution 65/14 (the “Viability resolution”), particularly the referral of the Viability Report to the dioceses for their consideration and response to the Standing Committee of the General Synod by 31 October 2014,

(a) expressed its preliminary view that changing the structures, policies and leadership of the Anglican Church of Australia (the “ACA”) will not, of itself, adequately address the underlying challenges faced by the ACA, although agrees that the focus of work in these areas may best be pursued on a provincial basis,
(b) called on the Standing Committee of the General Synod to ensure that clarity and confidence in the content of the gospel message and its faithful proclamation in word and deed across the ACA, particularly in the context of local Anglican churches, are at the fore of any proposal to respond to these challenges,
(c) affirmed its commitment to the diocese as the unit of organisation of the ACA and therefore calls on the Standing Committee of the General Synod to ensure that it consults widely with dioceses about the Viability Report and the Viability Resolution over a reasonable time frame before formulating any significant proposals which may require the support of dioceses,
(d) opposed as a matter of principle any proposal which would involve an increase in the central powers of the General Synod as a means by which the challenges faced by the ACA are sought to be addressed,
(e) indicated that the expectation of a considered response from dioceses to the Viability Report by 31 October 2014 was unrealistic.

The Synod invited members to send any comments on the Viability Report to the Diocesan Secretary and requested us to respond to the Viability Report taking any comments from Synod members into account.

Having taken into account the views expressed in the written submissions, we sent our response to the Viability Report to the Standing Committee of the General Synod, as well as to each Sydney General Synod Representative for their information.

A copy of our response to the Viability Report is printed separately.

We subsequently also confirmed our willingness to consider appropriate diocesan boundary changes in the Province of NSW. However we expressed our in principle opposition to the suggestion in the Viability
Report to create a new South Coast diocese on the basis that any suggestion to create additional dioceses is inconsistent with attempts to address issues of viability.

7.19 **Resolutions made by the Synod in 2014 and not mentioned in this report**
Circulars were sent to parishes and organisations about the matters arising from the 2014 Synod session. Copies of Synod resolutions were sent to appropriate persons and organisations.

7.20 **Ordinances for this session**
The bills for ordinances for this session of the Synod are printed separately, together with accompanying reports or explanatory statements.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ROBERT WICKS
*Diocesan Secretary*

18 September 2015
Synod Funds – Amalgamated

Annual financial report – 31 December 2014

Incorporating –

Fund 127 Work Outside the Diocese Fund
Fund 128 Mission Areas Fund
Fund 129 Synod Appropriation and Allocation Fund
Fund 130 Sydney Representative at General Synod Fund
Fund 131 Sydney Diocesan Synod Fund
Fund 153 The Archbishop’s Professional Standards Unit
Fund 189 Ordination Training Fund

Discussion and Analysis report for the year ended 31 December 2014

The Synod Funds’ (the Fund) Discussion and Analysis report provides an overview of the Fund’s financial activities for the calendar year ended 31 December 2014. The Discussion and Analysis should be read in conjunction with the unaudited annual report for the same period, and the notes thereto, beginning on page 67.

The Fund is an amalgamation of the individual funds listed below. At 31 December 2014 the Synod Funds comprised of 7 funds (2013: 7 funds):

Fund 127 Work Outside the Diocese Fund
Fund 128 Mission Areas Fund
Fund 129 Synod Appropriation and Allocation Fund
Fund 130 Sydney Representative at General Synod Fund
Fund 131 Sydney Diocesan Synod Fund
Fund 153 The Archbishop’s Professional Standards Unit
Fund 189 Ordination Training Fund

The component Funds of the amalgamation were unchanged during 2014.

The main sources of funds during 2014 were distributions from the Diocesan Endowment and various parish ordinances. A distribution from the Diocesan Endowment of $3,600,000 (2013: $3,335,000) was made available to the Fund for spending in 2014. The amount distributed to the Fund by various parish ordinances totalled $1,172,277 (2013: $1,494,772). In addition Work Outside the Diocese received donations of $11,947 (2013: $75,974). The Professional Standards Unit received $732,000 (2013: $20,000) as proceeds of claims from the ACPT Church Insurance Fund 0799. The Fund also received contributions under Parochial Cost Recoveries Ordinance to support the Professional Standards Unit, the Safe Ministry program and the costs associated with membership of the Anglican Church in Australia, the Province of New South Wales and the NSW Council of Churches. Also interest is earned on surplus cash held on deposit with the Glebe Administration Board.

The Fund’s total revenues increased by $686,155 or 12.31% from $5,576,152 (2013) to $6,262,307 (2014) due to the proceeds from insurance claims against the ACPT Church Insurance Fund used to support Care and Assistance Scheme payments.

The application of funds is divided between:

- grants appropriated by the Standing Committee in the Synod Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance 2012,
- grants as appropriated under the delegations of the various committees of the comprising funds, and
- administrative and Care and Assistance Scheme expenses of the Professional Standards Unit.

The Fund’s total outgoings decreased by $82,405 or 1.24% from $6,639,961 (2013) to $6,557,556 (2014).

The Net Assets of the Fund declined by 16.92% (2014: $1,449,468 compared to 2013: $1,744,717). The assets of the Fund are composed mainly of cash and receivables. Liabilities of the Fund represent accrued expenses and provisions for staff leave entitlements.
The Equity of each Fund represents accumulated surpluses from operations and capital contributed to Fund 0131. The Standing Committee resolutions establishing Fund 131 proposes a target equity balance of $1,000,000 to be achieved by replenishment of the capital by a combination of a contribution from the funds of the Synod and a levy on parishes. Standing Committee resolved that replenishment of Fund 131 equity in 2015 should be limited to $220,000. Consequently the target equity balance will not be reached in 2015.

In the medium term the Synod Funds face the potential for constrained income and greater contingent expenditure.

Current economic reports indicate the likelihood of a low interest rate environment with a subdued economy matched with volatile investment markets. In the medium to long term, these factors may affect the future distributions received by the Synod Appropriation and Allocation Fund and the grants and expenditures of the Synod Funds generally.

The Archbishop's Professional Standards Unit ("PSU") is funded by parishes through the Parochial Cost Recoveries charge. The 2014 level of funding has not been sufficient to cover the operating costs of the PSU, with a deficit of $112,518. Determining the appropriate level of revenue for the PSU is difficult due to the varying number of persons that may seek an alternative to civil litigation, and therefore incur costs under the pastoral care and assistance scheme. Sydney Diocesan Secretariat is currently working with the Director of PSU and the Diocesan Registrar to facilitate the development of a strategy to address the income of PSU.

There are no matters that have arisen since 31 December 2014 which are likely to have a significant effect on the Fund.

This report has been adopted at a duly constituted and convened meeting of the members of the Finance Committee of the Standing Committee of Synod on 11 June 2015.
### Income Statement for the 12 months ended 31 December 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributions - Diocesan Endowment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>3,335,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributions - Anglican Church Property Trust - Refer to Note 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,003,277</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,003,277</td>
<td>992,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributions - St James Hall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributions - 1 York Street (Special Distribution)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>312,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>16,046</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>31,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>605,998</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>605,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synod Grants</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000 (250,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>11,947</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,947</td>
<td>75,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,016</td>
<td>20,640</td>
<td>4,824</td>
<td>807,305</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>846,785</td>
<td>46,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>203,092</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>4,789,627</td>
<td>41,238</td>
<td>20,870</td>
<td>1,414,273</td>
<td>40,404</td>
<td>6,262,307</td>
<td>5,576,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Related</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>377,906</td>
<td>300,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66,778</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,433</td>
<td>137,305</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>211,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS Fees</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>780,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>866,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer &amp; Software</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent &amp; Occupancy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Stationery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,054</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment &amp; Travel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,429</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>2,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,875</td>
<td>10,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>7,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46,901</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subsidies</td>
<td>173,136</td>
<td>118,199</td>
<td>3,845,454</td>
<td>76,601</td>
<td>20,811</td>
<td>834,231</td>
<td>38,350 (250,000)</td>
<td>4,956,782</td>
<td>5,305,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Debts (Recovery)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,308)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,308)</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>188,136</td>
<td>127,405</td>
<td>4,792,088</td>
<td>106,601</td>
<td>26,244</td>
<td>1,526,791</td>
<td>40,291 (250,000)</td>
<td>6,557,556</td>
<td>6,639,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Surplus/ (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>14,956</td>
<td>(124,602)</td>
<td>(2,461)</td>
<td>(65,363)</td>
<td>(5,374)</td>
<td>(112,518)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>(295,249)</td>
<td>(1,063,809)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standing Committee of Synod - Synod Funds

Balance Sheet as at 31 December 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>102,426</td>
<td>223,859</td>
<td>402,155</td>
<td>35,421</td>
<td>580,766</td>
<td>49,428</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,543,316</td>
<td>2,113,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,021</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,961</td>
<td>25,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>4,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3,031</td>
<td>5,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>102,487</td>
<td>223,859</td>
<td>412,281</td>
<td>35,421</td>
<td>581,142</td>
<td>155,084</td>
<td>49,608</td>
<td>1,559,882</td>
<td>2,147,649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Liabilities                         |                                     |                             |                                          |                                       |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                     |                                     |
| Payables                            | -                                   | -                           | 16,710                                   | -                                     | 47,917                            | 4,200                               | -                                 | 66,827     | 37,449                                |
| Provisions                          | -                                   | -                           | -                                        | -                                     | 41,587                            | -                                   | -                                 | 41,587     | 365,483                               |
| Total liabilities                   | -                                   | -                           | 16,710                                   | -                                     | 89,504                            | 4,200                               | -                                 | 110,414    | 402,932                               |

Net assets 102,487 223,859 395,571 35,421 581,142 65,580 45,408 - 1,449,468 1,744,717

| Equity                              |                                     |                             |                                          |                                       |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                     |                                     |
| Capital                             | -                                   | -                           | -                                        | 985,000                               | -                                 | -                                   | -                                 | 985,000     | 985,000                               |
| Accumulated Funds                   | 87,531                              | 349,461                     | 398,032                                  | 100,784                               | (398,484)                         | 178,098                             | 45,296                           | 759,717     | 1,823,526                             |
| Current year                        | 14,956                              | (124,602)                   | (2,461)                                  | (65,363)                              | (5,374)                           | (112,518)                          | 113                              | (295,249)   | (1,063,809)                          |
| Total Equity                        | 102,487                             | 223,859                     | 395,571                                  | 35,421                                | 581,142                           | 65,580                             | 45,408                           | 1,449,468 | 1,744,717                             |

Notes to the financial report for the year ended 31 December 2014

1. Summary of significant accounting policies

The principal accounting policies adopted in the preparation of the financial report are set out below. These policies have been consistently applied to all the years presented, unless otherwise stated.

(a) Basis of preparation

This is a special purpose financial statement that has been prepared for the sole purpose of providing amalgamated financial information to Synod and for distribution to the members of Synod and must not be used for any other purpose. The Finance Committee of Standing Committee has determined that the accounting policies adopted are appropriate to meet the needs of Synod.

The income statement and balance sheet are submitted as amalgamated statements for administrative purposes. The process of amalgamation consists of adding all the balances of the individual funds on a line by line basis. There is no consideration of beneficial interests, which is involved or implied in the preparation of the amalgamated financial report. Material transactions have been eliminated between the funds.

The net assets at the date of exit of funds exiting the amalgamated accounts are debited to the relevant category of equity. The items of the statement of income for a fund that has exited the amalgamated accounts during the period are only included in the amalgamated accounts until the date of exit. When a fund is joining the amalgamated accounts a credit to equity is generally recognised to record the net assets that have been included in the amalgamated accounts.

Historical cost convention

These financial statements have been prepared under the historical cost convention.
(b) Revenue recognition
Revenue and other income is measured at the fair value of the consideration received or receivable. Amounts disclosed as revenue are net of taxes paid. Revenue and other income is recognised for the major business activities as follows:

**Grants and donations**
Grants and donations are recognised to the extent they have been deposited in the bank, which is the point at which the entity gains control of the grant or donation.

**Disposal of plant and equipment**
Income from the disposal of plant and equipment is measured at fair value of the consideration received or receivable less the carrying value of the fixed asset or group of assets sold. Gain or loss arising from the sale is recognised at net amount in the income statement.

**Distributions**
Distributions are recognised on an accruals basis when the right to receive payment is established.

**Interest**
Interest revenue is recognised on a time proportion basis using the effective interest method.

(c) Grants and donations expense
Grants and donations are generally recognised upon payment.

(d) Acquisitions of assets
The purchase method of accounting is used to account for all acquisitions of assets regardless of whether equity instruments or other assets are acquired. Cost is measured as the fair value of the assets given, shares issued or liabilities incurred or assumed at the date of exchange.

(e) Cash and cash equivalents
Cash and cash equivalents includes cash on hand, deposits held at call with financial institutions, other short-term, highly liquid investments with original maturities of three months or less that are readily convertible to known amounts of cash and which are subject to an insignificant risk of changes in value, and bank overdrafts. Bank overdrafts are shown within borrowings in current liabilities on the balance sheet.

(f) Receivables
Receivables are recognised initially at fair value and subsequently measured at amortised cost, less provision for doubtful debts. Receivables are due for settlement no more than 30 days from the date of recognition.

The collectability of receivables is reviewed on an ongoing basis. Debts, which are known to be uncollectible, are written off. A provision for doubtful receivables is established when there is objective evidence that the entity will not be able to collect all amounts due according to the original terms of receivables. The amount of the provision is recognised in the income statement.

(g) Fair value estimation
The fair value of financial assets and financial liabilities must be estimated for recognition and measurement or for disclosure purposes.

(h) Plant and equipment
Plant and equipment is stated at historical cost less depreciation. Historical cost includes expenditure that is directly attributable to the acquisition of the items.

Depreciation is calculated using the straight-line method to allocate their cost or re-valued amounts, net of their residual values, over their estimated useful lives as follows:
- Computer hardware and printers 3 years
- Furniture and fittings 10 years

The assets’ residual values and useful lives are reviewed, and adjusted if appropriate, at each balance sheet date.

(i) Payables
These amounts represent liabilities for goods and services provided prior to the end of financial year that are unpaid. The amounts are unsecured and are usually paid within 30 days of recognition.
Ordinary Session of Synod: Proceedings for 2015

(j) Provisions
Provisions are recognised when there is a present legal or constructive obligation as a result of past events; it is probable that an outflow of resources will be required to settle the obligation; and the amount has been reliably estimated.

Where there are a number of similar obligations, the likelihood that an outflow will be required in settlement is determined by considering the class of obligations as a whole. A provision is recognised even if the likelihood of an outflow with respect to any one item included in the same class of obligations may be small.

Provisions are measured at the present value of management’s best estimate of the expenditure required to settle the present obligation at the balance sheet date. The discount rate used to determine the present value reflects current market assessments of the time value of money and the risks specific to the liability. The increase in the provision due to the passage of time is recognised as interest expense.

(k) Employee benefits
Wages, salaries, annual leave and personal leave
Liabilities for wages and salaries including non-monetary benefits and annual leave expected to be settled within 12 months of the reporting date are recognised either in payables or current provisions in respect of employees’ services up to the reporting date and are measured at the amounts expected to be paid when the liabilities are settled.

No liability has been recognised for personal leave, as there is no provision made for personal leave and it is not considered that any personal leave taken will incur in additional costs.

Long service leave
The liability for long service leave expected to be settled more than 12 months from the reporting date is recognised as a provision and measured at the present value of expected future payments to be made in respect of services provided by employees up to the reporting date. Consideration is given to expected future wage and salary levels, experience of employee departures and periods of service. Expected future payments are discounted using market yields at the reporting date on national government bonds with terms to maturity that match, as closely as possible, the estimated future cash outflows.

Employee benefit on-costs are recognised and included in employee benefit liabilities and costs when the employee benefits to which they relate are recognised as liabilities.

(l) Goods and Service Tax (GST)
The funds are members of the Sydney Diocesan Secretariat GST group.

Revenues, expenses and assets are recognised net of the amount of GST, unless the GST incurred is not recoverable from the Australian Taxation Office (ATO). In these circumstances, it is recognised as part of the cost of acquisition of the asset or as part of the expense.

Receivables and payables are stated inclusive of the amount of GST receivable or payable. The net amount of GST recoverable from, or payable to, the ATO is included with other receivables or payables in the balance sheet.

(m) Income tax
The funds are exempt from income tax under Section 50-5 of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997.

2. Distributions – Anglican Church Property Trust – Synod Appropriation and Allocation Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.E.N.E.F Ordinance 1978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters Hill (Woolwich) Ordinance 1994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narellan (Elderslie) Land Sale Ordinance 1980</td>
<td>28,743</td>
<td>32,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde (Kirky Gdns. &amp; Archbold) Ordinance 2000</td>
<td>509,421</td>
<td>526,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney St Phillip (Resumption) Ordinance 19/1983</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>5,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Philip's Sydney York St Property Lease Ordinance 1966</td>
<td>160,644</td>
<td>77,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly Leasing and Variation of Trusts Ordinance 2006</td>
<td>254,706</td>
<td>220,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong Parish Leasing and Licensing Property Fund</td>
<td>11,535</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained net income from ACPT Fund 0400 for year ended 31/12/2012</td>
<td>32,848</td>
<td>38,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,003,277</strong></td>
<td><strong>992,131</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synod legal matters provision (a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits - annual leave</td>
<td>31,177</td>
<td>18,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31,177</strong></td>
<td><strong>358,138</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Movement in current provisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synod legal matters</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrying amount at start of year</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged to the income statement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts used during the year</td>
<td>(340,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying amount at end of year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Synod legal matters
Provision for Synod legal matters that affects the Diocese as a whole and which are not properly met by other Diocesan organisations or funds.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-current</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits - long service leave</td>
<td>10,410</td>
<td>7,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisions</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provisions - Current</td>
<td>31,177</td>
<td>358,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions - Non-current</td>
<td>10,410</td>
<td>7,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 31 December</td>
<td>41,587</td>
<td>365,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Equity - Capital
Use of the capital of Fund 0131 is restricted to meeting material external liabilities which affect the diocese as a whole and which are not properly met by other Diocesan organisations or funds.

6. Events occurring after the end of the reporting period
The members are not aware of any events occurring after the reporting period that impact on the financial report as at 31 December 2014.

The financial statements were authorised for issue on 11 June 2015 by the Committee.
MEMBERS DECLARATION

The members of the Finance Committee of Standing Committee of Synod declare that the financial statements and notes set out on pages 67 to 71:

(a) comply with the accounting policies summarised in note 1;
(b) give a fairly presented view of the Fund’s financial position as at 31 December 2014 and of its performance, as represented by the results of its operations and its cash flows, for the year ended on that date.

In the members’ opinion there are reasonable grounds to believe the individual funds will be able to pay its debts as and when they become due and payable.

This declaration is made in accordance with a resolution of the members.

Assurance Procedures

The Finance Committee engaged PricewaterhouseCoopers to undertake a range of “Agreed upon procedures” to provide assurance to the Finance Committee on the matters attested to in this declaration. The Agreed upon procedures covered the range of funds in the Synod group and included procedures covering the validity of the balances by reference to the general ledger, tests of income received, and tests of key expenses including Synod grants. The Finance Committee reviewed the results of the work undertaken by PricewaterhouseCoopers in forming its opinion on the Annual financial report.

JAMES FLAVIN          NICOLA WARWICK-MAYO
Member                Member
11 June 2015

Synod Funds Amalgamated
Report of factual findings to the members of the Finance Committee of the Standing Committee

Report on Agreed Upon Procedures for the following funds –

- Fund 127  SDSF Work Outside the Diocese
- Fund 128  SDSF Mission Areas Fund
- Fund 129  Sydney Diocesan Synod Fund
- Fund 130  Sydney Representatives at General Synod
- Fund 131  Sydney Diocesan Synod Fund (SDSF)
- Fund 153  SDA ABP’s Professional Standards Unit
- Fund 189  SDA Ordination Training Fund

We have performed the procedures agreed with you as detailed in the written instructions of 3 November 2014 and described below with respect to validity, accuracy and authorisation of transactions in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 [not reproduced here].

The members of the Finance Committee of the Standing Committee’s Responsibility for the Procedures Agreed

Management and the members of the Finance Committee of the Standing Committee are responsible for the adequacy or otherwise of the procedures agreed to be performed by us. You are responsible for determining whether the factual findings provided by us, in combination with any other information obtained, provide a reasonable basis for any conclusions which you wish to draw on the subject matter.
Assurance Practitioner’s Responsibility

Our responsibility is to report factual findings obtained from conducting the procedures agreed. We conducted the engagement in accordance with Standard on Related Services ASRS 4400 Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements to Report Factual Findings. We have complied with ethical requirements equivalent to those application to Other Assurance Engagements, including independence.

Because the agreed-upon procedures do not constitute either a reasonable or limited assurance engagement in accordance with AUASB standards, we do not express any conclusion and provide no assurance on validity, accuracy and authorisation of transactions of the entities listed above. Had we performed additional procedures or had we performed an audit or a review of the entities listed above in accordance with AUASB standards, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

Factual findings

The procedures were performed solely to assist you in evaluating the validity, accuracy and authorisation of transactions. Please refer to Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 [not reproduced here] for the procedures performed and the factual findings obtained.

Restriction on Distribution and Use of Report

This report is intended solely for the purpose set out above. As the intended user of our report, it is for you and other intended users to assess both the procedures and our factual findings to determine whether they provide, in combination with any other information you have obtained, a reasonable basis for any conclusions which you wish to draw on the subject matter. As required by ASRS 4400 Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements to Report Factual Findings, distribution of this report is restricted to those parties that have agreed the procedures to be performed with us and other intended users identified in the terms of the engagement (since others, unaware of the reasons for the procedures, may misinterpret the results). Accordingly, we expressly disclaim and do not accept any responsibility or liability to any party other [than] you for any consequences of reliance on this report for any purpose.

PricewaterhouseCoopers

FRANCOIS BRUDER
Principal

Sydney
1 April 2015
Parish Funds – Amalgamated

Annual financial report – 31 December 2014

Incorporating –

Parish Funds Funds 951 – 955 (unaudited)

Discussion and Analysis report for the year ended 31 December 2014

The Parish Funds’ Discussion and Analysis provides an overview of the Parish Funds’ financial activities for the calendar year ended 31 December 2014. The Discussion and Analysis should be read in conjunction with the unaudited annual report for the same period beginning on page 75.

The Parish Funds is a group of funds amalgamated in 2006 to administer clergy entitlements under the oversight of the Finance Committee of the Standing Committee of Synod.

This is a special purpose financial statement that has been prepared for the sole purpose of providing amalgamated financial information to Synod and for distribution to the members of Synod and must not be used for any other purpose.

At 31 December 2014 the Parish Funds amalgamation is comprised of 5 funds (2013: 5):

- Fund 951 Sydney Diocesan Parish Fund
- Fund 952 Stipend Continuance Fund (previously Clergy Benefits Fund)
- Fund 953 Long Service Leave Clearing Fund
- Fund 954 Sydney Diocesan Sickness & Accident Fund
- Fund 955 Clergy Removals Fund

Fund 952 has been renamed as the Stipend Continuance Fund.

The source of funds during 2014 were mainly from Parochial Cost Recoveries Charges on Parochial units as determined in the Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2013 passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 15 October 2013 and given assent to by the Archbishop on 17 October 2013. A distribution is received from ACPT Fund Moorebank Estate for the purposes of the Clergy Removal Fund. Interest is earned on cash held on deposit with the Glebe Administration Board through at call Glebe Income Accounts. Significant monies are also received in respect to claims by clergy on the Long Service Leave and Stipend Continuance schemes.

The Parish Funds total revenues increased by $1,520,849 or 11.0% (to $15,402,969) (2013 $13,882,120). This increase was contributed to by the following components: Superannuation Recovery, up $353,719 or 7.5%, claims on the Long Service Leave Fund up $420,295 or 48.6%, claims on insurers via the Stipend Continuance Fund up $174,463 or 33.9%, and contribution to the Parish outreach “Jesus Brings” of $150,600. At 31 December 2014 there were 8 clergy receiving stipend continuance claims (2013 6).

The application of funds is divided predominately between fixed “ministry costs” and variable “parochial network costs”. Ministry costs are a fixed cost per minister, being comprised of contributions to superannuation funds, the Long Service Leave Fund, the Sydney Diocesan Sickness and Accident Fund and cost of effecting stipend continuance insurance.

Under the Parochial Cost Recoveries Ordinance 2013 parochial network costs during 2014 were principally comprised of –

- the property and liability insurance program,
- the parish risk management program,
- the parish related work of the Professional Standards Unit,
- the safe ministry program,
- the Church Land Acquisition levy, and
- a contribution towards the costs of the Diocesan archives.
Funds were also applied to expenses such as Sydney Diocesan Secretariat fees and support of the Jesus Brings Program. The Parish Fund total outgoings increased by $1,488,133, or 10.7%, to $15,450,773 (2013 $13,962,640).

The Net Assets of the Parish Funds declined by 2.6% (2014 $1,784,804, 2013 $1,832,609). The assets of the Parish Funds are composed of cash and receivables. Liabilities of the Parish Funds represent accrued expenses and other payables.

The Equity of each Parish Fund represents accumulated surpluses from operations which are retained to provide working capital for the operations of each Fund. However, Fund 0951’s cash balance at year end December 2014 of $1.1 million was insufficient to fund the January and February 2015 superannuation and project payments. To cover the shortfall $70,000 was drawn from Fund 0953 pending receipt of the March 2015 recoveries.

The Stipend Continuance insurance premium is paid in advance based on estimates of the number of clergy eligible for cover and stipend rates. After the conclusion of the year the underwriter (AMP) calculates the premium due and an adjustment premium is invoiced. Due to the growth in the number of clergy in 2013, the adjustment is unusually high and is still being resolved with the underwriter.

There are no other matters that have arisen since 31 December 2014 which are likely to have a significant effect on the Funds.

This report has been adopted at a duly constituted and convened meeting of the members of the Finance Committee of the Standing Committee of Synod on 11 June 2015.

Standing Committee of Synod – Parish Funds
Amalgamated income and expenditure statement for the period ending 31 December 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>FUND 951 PARISH COSTS RECOVERY</th>
<th>FUND 952 STIPEND CONTINUANCE FUND</th>
<th>FUND 953 LONG SERVICE LEAVE</th>
<th>FUND 954 SICKNESS &amp; ACCIDENT</th>
<th>FUND 955 CLERGY REMOVALS FUND</th>
<th>ELIMINATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Dec-13 TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on cash</td>
<td>10,363</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>16,698</td>
<td>23,045</td>
<td>16,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorebank Estate - Distribution</td>
<td>3,500,027</td>
<td>5,900,027</td>
<td>3,375,085</td>
<td>1,962,006</td>
<td>1,962,006</td>
<td>5,900,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Superannuation Recovery</td>
<td>5,055,513</td>
<td>5,055,513</td>
<td>4,791,794</td>
<td>592,375</td>
<td>592,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR LSL Recovery</td>
<td>630,695</td>
<td>630,695</td>
<td>630,695</td>
<td>630,695</td>
<td>630,695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Risk Management Recovery</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Professional Standards Unit Recovery</td>
<td>506,001</td>
<td>506,001</td>
<td>506,001</td>
<td>492,923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Church Land Acquisition Levy</td>
<td>185,003</td>
<td>185,003</td>
<td>185,003</td>
<td>185,003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Administration Fee</td>
<td>68,002</td>
<td>68,002</td>
<td>68,002</td>
<td>49,790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Archives Recovery</td>
<td>10,998</td>
<td>10,998</td>
<td>10,998</td>
<td>10,998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR SAPAS Recovery</td>
<td>19,996</td>
<td>19,996</td>
<td>19,996</td>
<td>19,996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Relief or Remission Recovery</td>
<td>23,827</td>
<td>23,827</td>
<td>23,827</td>
<td>23,827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP Stipend Continuance receipts</td>
<td>459,947</td>
<td>459,947</td>
<td>459,947</td>
<td>459,947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Stipend Continuance Admin Fees</td>
<td>580,375</td>
<td>580,375</td>
<td>580,375</td>
<td>580,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Stipend Continuance Admin Fees</td>
<td>67,750</td>
<td>67,750</td>
<td>67,750</td>
<td>67,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend Continuance Organisations</td>
<td>64,918</td>
<td>64,918</td>
<td>64,918</td>
<td>64,918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend Continuance Orgs - Admin Fees</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSL - Buybacks</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSL - Claims - Anglican LSL Fund</td>
<td>1,285,949</td>
<td>1,285,949</td>
<td>1,285,949</td>
<td>1,285,949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSL - Organizations</td>
<td>109,190</td>
<td>109,190</td>
<td>109,190</td>
<td>109,190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSL - Organizations - Admin Fees</td>
<td>689,268</td>
<td>689,268</td>
<td>689,268</td>
<td>689,268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR S&amp;A Recovery</td>
<td>24,167</td>
<td>24,167</td>
<td>24,167</td>
<td>24,167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Parish outreach “Jesus Brings”</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td>150,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL INCOME | 13,171,330 | 1,413,844 | 2,116,849 | 27,316 | 23,017 | 1,349,387 | 15,402,969 | 13,882,120
### Amalgamated Balance Sheet as at 31 December 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FUND 951 PARISH COSTS RECOVERY</th>
<th>FUND 952 STIPEND CONTINUANCE FUND</th>
<th>FUND 953 LONG SERVICE LEAVE</th>
<th>FUND 954 SICKNESS &amp; ACCIDENT</th>
<th>FUND 955 CLERGY REMOVALS FUND</th>
<th>ELIMINATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Dec-13 TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>1,101,520</td>
<td>276,885</td>
<td>349,777</td>
<td>312,005</td>
<td>80,036</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,120,223</td>
<td>1,923,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Receivables - Parishes</td>
<td>39,436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,436</td>
<td>46,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisations Receivable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,558</td>
<td>18,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receivables</td>
<td>14,218</td>
<td>18,123</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,702</td>
<td>32,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Assets</strong></td>
<td>1,155,174</td>
<td>295,008</td>
<td>385,335</td>
<td>312,005</td>
<td>85,397</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,232,919</td>
<td>2,020,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSL Fund Payable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>184,854</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>184,854</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend Continuance Fund Payable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>173,502</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173,502</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation Clearing Account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14,242)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Payables</td>
<td>9,944</td>
<td>65,166</td>
<td>14,649</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89,759</td>
<td>201,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>9,944</td>
<td>238,668</td>
<td>199,503</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>448,115</td>
<td>187,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>1,145,230</td>
<td>56,340</td>
<td>185,832</td>
<td>312,005</td>
<td>85,397</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,784,004</td>
<td>1,832,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Surplus - Prior Year</td>
<td>1,114,379</td>
<td>106,536</td>
<td>186,328</td>
<td>342,974</td>
<td>82,391</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,832,608</td>
<td>1,913,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Surplus/(Deficit) - Current Year</td>
<td>30,851</td>
<td>(50,196)</td>
<td>(498)</td>
<td>(30,969)</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td></td>
<td>(47,804)</td>
<td>(80,529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Equity</strong></td>
<td>1,145,230</td>
<td>56,340</td>
<td>185,832</td>
<td>312,005</td>
<td>85,397</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,784,004</td>
<td>1,832,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes to the financial report for the year ended 31 December 2014

1. Summary of significant accounting policies

The principal accounting policies adopted in the preparation of the financial report are set out below. These policies have been consistently applied to all the years presented, unless otherwise stated.

(a) Basis of preparation

This is a special purpose financial statement that has been prepared for the sole purpose of providing amalgamated financial information to Synod and for distribution to the members of Synod and must not be used for any other purpose. The Standing Committee has determined that the accounting policies adopted are appropriate to meet the needs of Synod.

The statement of income and balance sheet are submitted as amalgamated statements for administrative purposes. The process of amalgamation consists of adding all the balances of the individual funds on a line by line basis. There is no consideration of beneficial interests, which is involved or implied in the preparation of the amalgamated financial report. Material transactions have been eliminated between the funds.

The net assets at the date of exit of funds exiting the amalgamated accounts are debited to the relevant category of equity. The items of the statement of income for a fund that has exited the amalgamated accounts during the period are only included in the amalgamated accounts until the date of exit. When a fund is joining the amalgamated accounts a credit to equity is generally recognised to record the net assets that have been included in the amalgamated accounts.

Historical cost convention

These financial statements have been prepared under the historical cost convention.

(b) Revenue recognition

Revenue and other income is measured at the fair value of the consideration received or receivable. Amounts disclosed as revenue are net of taxes paid. Revenue and other income is recognised for the major business activities as follows:

Grants and donations

Grants and donations are recognised to the extent they have been deposited in the bank, which is the point at which the entity gains control of the grant or donation.

Distributions

Distributions are recognised on an accruals basis when the right to receive payment is established.

Interest

Interest revenue is recognised on a time proportion basis using the effective interest method.

Recoveries

Personnel cost recoveries from parochial and non-parochial units have been accounted for as income received in respect of certain clergy entitlements to cover superannuation contributions, insurances and other premiums paid on behalf of parochial and non-parochial units.

Diocesan program costs recovered from parochial units have been accounted for as income received in respect of insurances and other centrally managed programs.

Recognition is on an accruals basis.

(c) Grants and donations expense

Grants and donations are generally recognised upon payment.

(d) Acquisitions of assets

The purchase method of accounting is used to account for all acquisitions of assets regardless of whether equity instruments or other assets are acquired. Cost is measured as the fair value of the assets given, shares issued or liabilities incurred or assumed at the date of exchange.

(e) Cash and cash equivalents

Cash and cash equivalents includes cash on hand, deposits held at call with financial institutions, other short-term, highly liquid investments with original maturities of three months or less that are readily convertible to known amounts of cash and which are subject to an insignificant risk of changes in value, and bank overdrafts. Bank overdrafts are shown within borrowings in current liabilities on the balance sheet.
(f) Receivables
Receivables are recognised initially at fair value and subsequently measured at amortised cost, less provision for doubtful debts. Receivables are due for settlement no more than 30 days from the date of recognition.

The collectability of receivables is reviewed on an ongoing basis. Debts, which are known to be uncollectible, are written off. A provision for doubtful receivables is established when there is objective evidence that the entity will not be able to collect all amounts due according to the original terms of receivables. The amount of the provision is recognised in the income statement.

(g) Fair value estimation
The fair value of financial assets and financial liabilities must be estimated for recognition and measurement or for disclosure purposes.

(h) Payables
These amounts represent liabilities for goods and services provided prior to the end of financial year that are unpaid. The amounts are unsecured and are usually paid within 30 days of recognition.

(i) Provisions
Provisions are recognised when there is a present legal or constructive obligation as a result of past events; it is probable that an outflow of resources will be required to settle the obligation; and the amount has been reliably estimated.

Where there are a number of similar obligations, the likelihood that an outflow will be required in settlement is determined by considering the class of obligations as a whole. A provision is recognised even if the likelihood of an outflow with respect to any one item included in the same class of obligations may be small.

Provisions are measured at the present value of management's best estimate of the expenditure required to settle the present obligation at the balance sheet date. The discount rate used to determine the present value reflects current market assessments of the time value of money and the risks specific to the liability. The increase in the provision due to the passage of time is recognised as interest expense.

(j) Goods and Service Tax (GST)
The funds are members of the Sydney Diocesan Secretariat GST group.

Revenues, expenses and assets are recognised net of the amount of GST, unless the GST incurred is not recoverable from the Australian Taxation Office (ATO). In these circumstances, it is recognised as part of the cost of acquisition of the asset or as part of the expense.

Receivables and payables are stated inclusive of the amount of GST receivable or payable. The net amount of GST recoverable from, or payable to, the ATO is included with other receivables or payables in the balance sheet.

(k) Income tax
The funds are exempt from income tax under Section 50-5 of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997.

2. Events occurring after the end of the reporting period
The members are not aware of any events occurring after the reporting period that impact on the financial report as at 31 December 2014.

The financial statements were authorised for issue on 11 June 2015 by the Finance Committee of Standing Committee of Synod.
MEMBERS DECLARATION

The members of the Finance Committee of Standing Committee of Synod declare that the financial statements and notes set out on pages 75 to 78:

(a) comply with the accounting policies summarised in note 1;
(b) give a fairly presented view of the Fund’s financial position as at 31 December 2014 and of its performance, as represented by the results of its operations and its cash flows, for the year ended on that date.

In the members’ opinion there are reasonable grounds to believe the individual funds will be able to pay its debts as and when they become due and payable.

This declaration is made in accordance with a resolution of the members.

Assurance Procedures

The Finance Committee engaged PricewaterhouseCoopers to undertake a range of “Agreed upon procedures” to provide assurance to the Finance Committee on the matters attested to in this declaration. The Agreed upon procedures covered the range of funds in the Synod group and included procedures covering the validity of the balances by reference to the general ledger, tests of income received, and tests of key expenses including Synod grants. The Finance Committee reviewed the results of the work undertaken by PricewaterhouseCoopers in forming its opinion on the Annual financial report.

JAMES FLAVIN NICOLA WARWICK-MAYO
Member Member 11 June 2015

Parish Funds Amalgamated
Report of factual findings to the members of the Finance Committee of the Standing Committee

Report on Agreed Upon Procedures for the following funds –
 Fund 951 Sydney Diocesan Parish Fund
 Fund 952 Clergy Benefits Fund
 Fund 953 Long Service Leave Fund
 Fund 954 Sydney Diocesan Sickness & Accident Fund
 Fund 955 Clergy Removals Fund

We have performed the procedures agreed with you as detailed in the written instructions of 3 November 2014 and described below with respect to validity, accuracy and authorisation of transactions listed in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 [not reproduced here].

The members of the Finance Committee of the Standing Committee’s Responsibility for the Procedures Agreed

Management and the members of the Finance Committee of the Standing Committee are responsible for the adequacy or otherwise of the procedures agreed to be performed by us. You are responsible for determining whether the factual findings provided by us, in combination with any other information obtained, provide a reasonable basis for any conclusions which you wish to draw on the subject matter.

Assurance Practitioner’s Responsibility

Our responsibility is to report factual findings obtained from conducting the procedures agreed. We conducted the engagement in accordance with Standard on Related Services ASRS 4400 Agreed-Upon
Procedures Engagements to Report Factual Findings. We have complied with ethical requirements equivalent to those application to Other Assurance Engagements, including independence.

Because the agreed-upon procedures do not constitute either a reasonable or limited assurance engagement in accordance with AUASB standards, we do not express any conclusion and provide no assurance on validity, accuracy and authorisation of transactions of the entities listed above. Had we performed additional procedures or had we performed an audit or a review of the entities listed above in accordance with AUASB standards, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

Factual findings
The procedures were performed solely to assist you in evaluating the validity, accuracy and authorisation of transactions. Please refer to Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 [not reproduced here] for the procedures performed and the factual findings obtained.

Restriction on Distribution and Use of Report
This report is intended solely for the purpose set out above. As the intended user of our report, it is for you and other intended users to assess both the procedures and our factual findings to determine whether they provide, in combination with any other information you have obtained, a reasonable basis for any conclusions which you wish to draw on the subject matter. As required by ASRS 4400 Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements to Report Factual Findings, distribution of this report is restricted to those parties that have agreed the procedures to be performed with us and other intended users identified in the terms of the engagement (since others, unaware of the reasons for the procedures, may misinterpret the results). Accordingly, we expressly disclaim and do not accept any responsibility or liability to any party other [than] you for any consequences of reliance on this report for any purpose.

PricewaterhouseCoopers
FRANCOIS BRUDER
Principal
Sydney
1 April 2015
30/14 Church Land Acquisition Levy

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

Key points
- There remains an urgent need to purchase land for future church sites.
- A recent wide-ranging review did not identify any significant sources of additional funding for the purchase of future church sites other than the current church land acquisition levy.
- It is intended to include the church land acquisition levy as part of the Synod’s funding arrangements for at least the 2016-2018 triennium.

Purpose
1. To provide the Synod with the mid and long term views of the need for the Mission Property Committee “Church Land Acquisition Levy”.

Recommendation
2. Synod receive this report.

Background
3. Synod passed resolution 30/14 in the following terms –

   ‘Synod requests the Standing Committee to provide the 2015 Synod session with a report of the mid and long term views of the need for the Mission Property Committee (MPC) “Church Land Acquisitions Levy”.

   Synod requests that this report should also outline possible future strategies for raising these funds from parishes and other sources so that parishes may be informed of expected financial commitments for mid and long term planning purposes.’

4. At its meeting on 10 November 2014 the Standing Committee requested the Diocesan Resources Committee to prepare, in consultation with the Mission Property Committee and the Strategic Research Group, a report addressing the matters in resolution 30/14.

5. After consulting with the Mission Property Committee and the Strategic Research Group, the Diocesan Resources Committee prepared this report on behalf of the Standing Committee.

Response
6. The Mission Property Committee has repeatedly demonstrated there is an urgent need to purchase land for future church sites.

7. It is evident that, on its own, the Mission Property Committee lacks the resources to meet this need. Even together with the very welcome contributions coming from donations by individuals, parishes and other organisations, together with the application of a portion of the sale proceeds of parish property as a result of the Large Receipts Policy, the amount of new funds received each year is clearly insufficient.

8. A significant, on-going and reliable source of funds is needed to enable the Mission Property Committee to adequately address the need to purchase land for future church sites.

9. It is apparent there is no easy source for such funds. A recent wide-ranging review of potential sources of funds did not identify any significant new sources of funds. Furthermore –
   (a) there is no appetite to appropriate funds from the Diocesan Endowment,
   (b) the funds available annually to the Synod are limited and are already fully allocated to other requirements and mission commitments, and
   (c) Synod agreed in 2013 to a levy on parishes for the purpose of assisting the Mission Property Committee to purchase land for future church sites, and in 2014 the Standing Committee affirmed and continued that levy for a second year.

10. The Diocesan Resources Committee acknowledges the appropriateness of direct fundraising as a contribution to meeting the cost of new ministry buildings; encourages parishes to continue to raise their own funds for local initiatives; and encourages individuals and parishes to give generously to support the acquisition of land for future church sites. We also note the Archbishop’s initiative for fundraising for New Churches for New Communities which seeks to raise funds for new ministry centres on land acquired by the Mission Property Committee.
11. The Statement of Funding Principles for 2016-2018 prepared for Synod in 2014 indicated “a levy on parishes of 2% of their net operating receipts should continue to be used to assist the Mission Property Committee to fund the acquisition of land for future church sites”.

12. The Diocesan Resources Committee intends therefore to include such a levy in the draft ordinances it prepares for Standing Committee and Synod for the 2016-2018 triennium, and indicates that while the situation should be reviewed at the beginning of every triennium, on present indications it would envisage the need for such a levy would continue at least for the mid term, and possibly longer.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

BISHOP PETER HAYWARD

Chair, Diocesan Resources Committee

2 March 2015
Reducing the environmental impact of St Andrew’s House

(A report from the St Andrew’s House Corporation.)

Key points
- In March 2015, St Andrew’s House achieved a 5.0 star energy rating under the National Australian Built Environment Rating System (NABERS).
- Improved energy efficiency of St Andrew’s House has led to estimated savings of $80,000 in electricity costs from 2012 to 2014.
- Water and waste management efficiencies for St Andrew’s House are expected to increase as new technologies and practices are implemented.

Purpose
1. To advise the Synod about –
   (a) the receipt of a formal energy rating for St Andrew’s House (“SAH”) under the National Australian Built Environment Rating System (“NABERS”), and
   (b) other steps taken to reduce the environmental impact of SAH,
in light of Synod resolution 17/07 on climate change.

Recommendation
2. Synod receive this report.

Background
3. At its session in 2007, the Synod passed resolution 17/07 as follows –
   “Synod accepts the emerging scientific consensus that climate change is occurring and supports the need for Christian responses to the potential problems and opportunities that arise from climate change including –
   (a) praying for our world and using every opportunity to speak of the Lordship of Jesus Christ;
   (b) Christian ministry to those most vulnerable to the effects of climate change such as farmers, rural communities, the homeless and refugees;
   (c) the setting of a godly example of good stewardship in our personal and communal lives;
   (d) education of our children about a biblical understanding of creation and our role as its stewards and carers;
   (e) the development and implementation of an environmental policy within each Parish and Diocesan organisation which expresses principles of good environmental stewardship and care; and
   (f) encouraging governments at all levels to take climate change seriously and to make wise policy decisions to deal with its effects.”

4. This report updates a report provided to the Synod in 2008 which outlined in general terms the response taken to Synod resolution 17/07 in relation to SAH.

Improving the energy efficiency of St Andrew’s House
5. In 2009, the St Andrew’s House Corporation (the “Corporation”) engaged Hyder Consulting (“Hyder”) to specify any works that would be expected to improve the NABERS rating of SAH. NABERS is a performance based environmental impact based measurement system for commercial buildings. NABERS is capable of measuring the energy efficiency, water usage, waste management and indoor environment quality of a building and its impact on the environment. However the NABERS rating for SAH specifically related to energy consumption.

6. The recommendations of Hyder took into account previous upgrades and replacement of plant within SAH, particularly the replacement of two large chillers and indicated a potential NABERS energy rating of 4.5 stars for SAH.

7. In late 2010, a commitment agreement with the then NABERS government agency, the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (“DEECW”), now the Office of Environment and Heritage (“OEH”), was entered into in which the Corporation expressed an intent to attain a NABERS 4.5 star energy
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rating for SAH. This was a consequence of leasing levels 3 to 5 of SAH on the departure of the Australian Bureau of Statistics. There is no requirement under existing leases to attain this energy rating.

8. In late 2011, as part of the level 3 and 4 building works, the Corporation approved works that would enable the achievement of a NABERS 4.5 star energy rating for SAH.

NABERS formal assessment

9. In 2012, Colliers International (“Colliers”) was formally engaged to measure and collate all appropriate data for NABERS, periodically estimate the NABERS rating and when appropriate, formally apply for and obtain a minimum NABERS energy rating of 4.5 for SAH. The NABERS certification protocols require that energy data covering a 12 month period be independently assessed. This data is then used by OEH to provide a formal energy star rating.

10. Reports were provided to the Corporation in 2012 and 2013 regarding the progress towards a formal rating and the extensive work that needed to be undertaken to recommission measurement equipment before the 12 month formal collection of uninterrupted data could commence. This finally commenced in January 2014 after a number of mechanical issues with the meters used to measure energy usage were resolved.

11. The 12 months of uninterrupted, accurate and appropriate data was recorded between January and December 2014 that was then used to apply for a formal NABERS energy rating. The Colliers accredited NABERS assessor made formal application to the OEH in February 2015.

12. The documentation was assessed by OEH and a formal NABERS rating of 5.0 Stars for the SAH base building systems was received on 3 March 2015.

13. The NABERS energy rating of 5.0 stars takes into account the allowance in the NABERS protocol to deduct energy used by St Andrew’s Cathedral School, the retail arcade and the car park: all of which are separately metered and measured by the SAH building management system. No ‘Green Power’ was purchased in order to influence the SAH rating.

14. The formal notice of the energy rating for SAH will be publicised in the main foyer and other appropriate areas of the building.

Further NABERS assessment

15. The official 5.0 star rating was based on energy data collated over the 2014 calendar year. Colliers advise that on re-assessment later this year that a NABERS energy rating of 5.5 to 6.0 stars is achievable as the result of measuring the full impact of replacing the old pneumatic controls and building management system throughout SAH that were completed in the latter half of 2014.

Energy reductions

16. From 2009 to 2014, as a result of the capital works undertaken in respect of improving the energy efficiency of SAH, electricity usage has dropped by 765,000kWh (about 20%). This roughly equates to a reduction of 530,000kg of ‘carbon emissions’ or the equivalent to taking 111 cars off the road. Gas usage has also declined by 125,000MJ, equivalent to a reduction in carbon emission of 27,000 kg (or 6 cars). Water usage continues to be managed effectively.

17. The reduction in electricity and gas usage has improved the financial performance of SAH, albeit tempered by increasing energy costs. It is estimated that savings of about $80,000 in electricity costs from 2012 to 2014 have been achieved.

Waste management, recycling and water usage in St Andrew’s House

18. Waste management, recycling and water usage practices in SAH are managed by the building property manager. Records in relation to general waste and recycling of cardboard, paper, plastic and cans have been kept by the building property manager since 2013. These show a drop in general waste from SAH from 308.33 tonnes (in 2013) to 263.68 tonnes (in 2014). Over the same period, recycling of cardboard, paper, plastic and cans increased from 55.66 tonnes to 59.02 tonnes. Water usage is regularly monitored and water efficiency practices are reviewed and implemented.

19. It is expected that further water and waste management efficiencies will increase in the future as new technology and practices are implemented.

For and on behalf of the St Andrew’s House Corporation.

LAURIE SCANDRETT
Chair

30 April 2015
7/14 Fellowship meals for the proclamation of Christ’s death

(A report of the Sydney Diocesan Doctrine Commission.)

1. The Purpose and Limits of this Report

1.1 This report has been written in response to the following request from the 2007 Sydney Synod:

Synod requests the Diocesan Doctrine Commission to consider the appropriateness, with respect to the teaching of Scripture and the Anglican formularies, of Anglican churches having a fellowship meal for the proclamation of the Lord’s death, and to bring a report to Synod at a convenient time. (Resolution 37/07)

The question under discussion, therefore, is quite specific: In light of what both Scripture and the Anglican formularies teach about the practice of believers eating together and its connection with the proclamation of Jesus’ death, is it ‘appropriate’ (that is, is it required by, implied by, or at least consistent with, such teaching) to have a fellowship meal to proclaim the Lord’s death?

1.2 Whereas our historic Anglican practice of celebrating ‘The Lord’s Supper’ or ‘The Holy Communion’ is a fellowship meal in which a small piece of bread and a sip of wine is shared, the Synod request seems to be asking about a more substantial meal shared by members of a church.

1.3 The question, then, is not whether such a ‘fellowship meal’ is the only way, or even the best way, of proclaiming Christ’s death. Nor is it being proposed that such meals take the place of our historic practice of celebrating ‘The Lord’s Supper’ or ‘The Holy Communion’. The question is simply whether such meals can be an ‘appropriate’ way of proclaiming Christ’s death.

1.4 In order to address this question, the report will briefly examine the nature and meaning of meals in the New Testament (sections 2 and 3), and the relevance of the Anglican formularies to this discussion (section 4). After offering some brief conclusions (section 5), it will then outline a series of ‘guiding principles’ for contemporary fellowship meals, so that they might effectively proclaim Jesus’ sacrificial death for sinners (section 6).

2. The Significance of Meals in the Time of Jesus

2.1 In the period of the New Testament, shared meals were profoundly significant for all the cultures of the Mediterranean world. Eating with someone not only expressed welcome and friendship, but frequently symbolized social equality and spiritual unity. Indeed, outside of household settings, where extended families normally came together, most people only ate with those who belonged to the same social class or religious grouping. Even at patron-client dinners, where there was a clear social hierarchy, the importance of a relationship that was in some sense reciprocal was undeniable.

2.2 For the Jews of the New Testament period meals had a special significance. Not only did they express intimacy and acceptance of one another, they were governed by the expectations of the Jewish Law concerning what could and could not be eaten, and with whom it could and could not be eaten. Meals helped establish a clear boundary line between those who were and those who were not the true people of God. Only faithful Israelites (and occasionally sympathetic Gentiles) could eat together. Unrepentant Israelites (‘the wicked’) and pagan enemies were necessarily excluded.

2.3 The Pharisees, in particular, were strongly convinced that Israel’s identity and destiny depended on her moral and ritual purity. Indeed the Pharisees came into existence as a sect in reaction to the compromising tendencies of many of their Jewish contemporaries, including a number of leading priests. Among other things, their concern for purity meant that they would only eat with those who had ‘undefiled hands’ (Mk 7:2-4). This, as we see in the Gospels, commonly led both to pride and to contempt for the less observant Israelites (‘the wicked’) and pagan enemies were necessarily excluded.

2.4 Jesus’ eating with tax collectors and sinners demonstrated a clear rejection of the social and religious exclusivism of the Pharisees (Mt 9:10). Therefore, it is not surprising that they roundly criticized him, complaining: ‘This man receives sinners and eats with them’ (Lk 15:2). Nor is it surprising that he became widely known as ‘a friend of tax collectors and sinners’ (Mt 11:19). Furthermore, Jesus challenged contemporary self-serving approaches to meals, urging banquet hosts not to invite those who would repay them in kind (e.g., friends, family, rich neighbours). Rather they should adopt an attitude of grace and faith, inviting those who cannot repay (e.g., the poor, the crippled, the blind) and awaiting repayment ‘at the resurrection of the just’ (Lk 14:12-14).

2.5 Contrary to the criticisms of the scribes and Pharisees, Jesus’ willingness to eat with anyone who would eat with him in no way reflected moral delinquency and spiritual bankruptcy. His explanation as to why he ate with tax collectors and sinners was simple: ‘Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners’ (Mt 9:12-13; Lk 5:31-32).
In other words, Jesus understood himself to be the great physician who had come to bring salvation to any who would receive him. His freedom to eat and associate with ‘sinners’, then, stemmed from his conviction that not only would their corruption fail to infect him, but that his presence with them signaled the arrival of their salvation (Lk 19:9-10).

2.6 In keeping with the promises of the Old Testament (e.g., Isa 25:6-9), Jesus regularly spoke of the coming of the kingdom of God in terms of a great feast (Mt 22:1-14; Lk 14:15-24). This aspect of the prophetic hope is inextricably linked to the coming of Israel’s Messiah (Isa 55:1-5). This coming would supply ample reason for celebration: God’s great eschatological promises would be fulfilled in the resurrection of the dead and in a new heaven and new earth in which righteousness dwells (2 Pet 3:13). According to Jesus, feasting with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob would be a significant part of the experience of the coming kingdom of God (Mt 8:11; Lk 13:28-29).

2.7 The most significant of all the meals in which Jesus participated during the course of his earthly ministry was the ‘last supper’ he shared with his disciples (Mt 26:17-35; Mk 14:12-31; Lk 22:7-38; Jn 13-17). The meal was a Passover – i.e., the annual, memorial feast that celebrated the deliverance of the people of Israel from their bondage to the Egyptians in the time of Moses. In the course of Israel’s history, the Passover also came to look forward, as well as backward, eagerly expecting the final deliverance of the people when the Messiah comes.

2.8 Jesus himself highlighted the unique significance of this particular Passover meal, declaring it to be the last meal he would eat until the kingdom of God comes, and linking it with his own imminent death for his people (Lk 22:16-20). As Israel’s Messiah, Jesus then reinterpreted the meal in terms of the fulfilment it would find in his death (‘he took bread … and said, “this is my body” … and he took a cup … saying, “this is my blood”’, Mt 26:26, 28). In other words, his body about to be poured out for them on the cross would secure the long awaited redemption of Israel (Lk 24:21), so that ‘repentance and forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in his name to the nations’ (Lk 24:47).

3. The Fellowship Meals of the First Christians

3.1 The book of Acts tells us that along with the apostles’ teaching, the fellowship and the prayers, the first Christians devoted themselves to ‘the breaking of bread’ (Acts 2:42, 46). Whilst this language may possibly suggest a link between these occasions and Jesus’ actions and instructions at the last supper (Lk 24:30), it certainly indicates that they shared real meals together (Acts 20:7,11; 27:35). Moreover, as they ate together in each other’s homes, ‘they received their food with glad and generous hearts, praising God’ (vv. 46b-47a). Thus, the ‘ordinary meals’ of the first Christians were far from ordinary; they were a vital expression of their fellowship and occasions of joyful thanksgiving. It was in this context that ‘the Lord added to their number day by day those who were being saved’ (v. 47b).

3.2 The significance of meals for the first Christians is also evident in the prominent role they played in a number of the disputes and developments that arise in the New Testament. For example, a major section of 1 Corinthians (chapters 8-11) deals with a range of issues regarding eating: e.g., with whom Christians should eat, what they should or should not eat, and how they should eat together. Similarly, the initiation of ministry to Gentiles is brought about through Peter’s wrestling with the question of what he can eat (Acts 10). Through a series of visions of food hitherto unclean, but now cleansed by God (vv. 10-16), he was brought to understand that he was free to go and visit the Gentile, Cornelius (vv. 19-20, 28, 34-35). Because he could now associate and eat with Cornelius and his household, Peter was able to share Christ with them in person (vv. 36-43) and remain with them for some days (v. 48).

3.3 A major conflict among the apostles in the New Testament also concerned meals. In Galatians 2, Paul recounts a particularly serious disagreement between himself and Peter over the question of with whom one can eat. Peter had initially eaten with Gentile believers in Antioch, but after some visitors had come from James in Jerusalem, he drew back and separated himself (v. 12). Before long the rest of the Jewish believers, including Barnabas, followed his lead (v. 13). In light of the lesson Peter learned and articulated in Acts 10, the incident is particularly puzzling. Whatever rationale Peter may have provided for withdrawing from eating with Gentile believers, as far as Paul was concerned Peter was not only acting hypocritically, but in a way that was patently inconsistent with the truth of gospel (2:13-14). For Jewish believers to eat separately from Gentile believers was, in effect, to imply that their common salvation by Christ through faith was insufficient for table fellowship. This redrawing of old boundary lines (see Eph 2:11–16) sent the message that justification was, after all, by works of the law and not through faith in Christ (Gal 2:16). Paul insisted that if this were true, ‘then Christ died for no purpose’ (v. 21). The lesson from this incident is clear: the practice of Christians (Jew and Gentile, male and female, slave and free) eating together is inextricably bound up with the truth of the gospel, in particular with the significance of Jesus’ death.
3.4 In the case of the unrepentant immoral brother in the Corinthian congregation, however, the apostle Paul insists on a withdrawal of table fellowship. His instruction is ‘not to associate … not even to eat with such a one’ (1 Cor. 5:11). Such a withdrawal would be highly significant, indicating the seriousness of the offender’s behaviour and its incompatibility with a confession of faith in Christ. Eating together is an act of genuine fellowship. Declining to eat together signals the withdrawal of such fellowship.

3.5 The fellowship meals of the first Christians certainly gave expression to gospel truths, particularly the death of Jesus, which brought Jew and Gentile, slave and free together. In this sense, their meals were an advertisement of the power of reconciliation in Christ, whose blood broke down the dividing wall of hostility that existed between them (Eph 2:14-16). Therefore, we may wish to answer the Synod request in the affirmative. It is certainly appropriate for churches to express their fellowship in Christ through sharing a meal, especially given the fact that every church is made up of a variety of different people who may have never gathered together if it were not for Christ. All such fellowship meals could be said to ‘proclaim’ the death of Jesus.

3.6 The link between eating and drinking and the proclamation of Jesus’ death is made explicit in 1 Corinthians 11:26: ‘For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim [kataggellete] the Lord’s death until he comes.’ It is commonly understood that Paul is here speaking of a meal that recalls the words and actions of Jesus at the Last Supper and which invested the bread broken before the meal and wine shared after the meal with particular significance. Some, however, argue that the activity of sharing a meal when gathered as Christ’s body itself proclaims the Lord’s death.  

3.7 What both views have in common is an understanding that the proclamation of which Paul speaks took place in the context of a real fellowship meal. Moreover, on either view, the proclamation of the Lord’s death in such meals should continue, as Paul says it will, ‘until he comes’ (v. 26). This not only underscores the significance of these occasions, but introduces an eschatological element to the gathering and its meal: Christians not only look back, memorialising and proclaiming Christ’s death, but also look forward (in anticipation) to the banquet that he will share with those he has redeemed from every nation, tribe, people and tongue in the consummated kingdom of God.

4. Fellowship Meals and the Anglican Formularies

4.1 For reasons that are not altogether clear, by the middle of the second century, the practice of churches sharing a full meal (often referred to as ‘the love feast) had developed into the practice of sharing a token meal of a more structured and ceremonial nature (usually referred to as ‘the eucharist’). It was this latter practice that was inherited by the English Protestants at the time of the Reformation. However, due to the influence of the Wycliffe Bible (1382-1395), it was more commonly referred to as ‘the Lord’s Supper’ or otherwise ‘Holy Communion’.

4.2 The expression ‘the Anglican formularies’ in Sydney Synod resolution 37/07 refers to The Book of Common Prayer, The Ordinal (i.e., the Ordination Services contained in the Book of Common Prayer), and The Articles of Religion (otherwise known as The Thirty-Nine Articles). According to the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia, these documents articulate the ‘ruling principles’ of our beliefs and practices.

4.3 While the Thirty-nine Articles do not address the subject of fellowship meals in general, Article XXVIII makes use of Paul’s words in 1 Corinthians 10-11 in connection with the church’s practice of the Lord’s Supper. This it refers to as ‘a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ’s death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ: and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.’ The formularies understand the historic practice of sharing in a symbolic meal in the context of the regular gathering of Christ’s disciples around the Word and in the Spirit in the light of Paul’s encouragement to ‘proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.’

4.4 This connection continues in The Book of Common Prayer’s “Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper”. It is, in fact, strengthened in the exhortations appointed to be read at the time of Communion, in which the warning about unworthy eating is written in the same terms as those in which Paul describes the effects of unworthy eating in 1 Corinthians 11:30ff. The formularies simply identify the Holy Communion with the meal Paul had in mind as he wrote to the Corinthians.

4.5 Despite this identification, “An Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper” does not preclude other ‘fellowship meals for the proclamation of Jesus’ death.’ By implication, however, the same theological realities (i.e., the death of Christ, our participation in him by faith and our unity with one another) should shape all such church meals.

---

1 These two views are outlined in a working paper presented to the Doctrine Commission in the course of preparing this report. The paper is available as a resource at www.sds.asn.au on the Diocesan Doctrine Commission Reports page.
5. Conclusions

5.1 The answer to the question asked by the Sydney Synod is in one sense quite straightforward. Every opportunity to remember and proclaim Christ’s death both to one another and publicly before the community is to be welcomed. Furthermore, as we have seen, the New Testament expects that the Lord’s death will be remembered and proclaimed in ways that are consistent with the meaning and significance of that death. In particular, the death of Jesus draws us into loving fellowship not only with the triune God himself but also with each other in an environment where worldly divisions between those gathered are unwelcome.

5.2 The historic practice of Anglicans has been to proclaim the Lord’s death in the context of eating and drinking together by our participation in ‘The Holy Communion’. The liturgy provided in The Book of Common Prayer sought to embody gospel truths and especially the theological realities presented by Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians. The same theological principles that properly guide participation in the Holy Communion should shape all other fellowship meals in which the truth of Jesus’ death for our sins and his rising for our justification is remembered and proclaimed.

5.3 It seems important, then, to conclude with some guiding principles for fellowship meals that will help ensure that they appropriately and effectively proclaim Christ’s death. These are by no means exhaustive, but seek to provide a foundation for serious theological reflection upon the form and content of such meals.

6. Guiding Principles for Fellowship Meals

6.1 Such meals should be Christian gatherings, even if they take place at a time and in a place different from the regular gatherings of this group of God’s people. (There is no reason why such fellowship meals could not take place in the homes of believers, as they did in the early church.) This basic principle of identity means that the theological realities that should govern all of our gatherings will also apply to this gathering.

6.2 While believers’ eating and drinking together may be a demonstration of the power of Christ’s death to break down all dividing walls of hostility, it will always be appropriate for this to be explained in spoken words. In such a context, it is important to relate participation in the meal to the gospel of the death of Christ. In this way the thoughts and hearts of the participants will be focused on the Lord Jesus Christ and the Father’s love for unworthy sinners. At the same time, the congregation can rejoice together in their common experience of God’s grace in Christ and ‘feed on him in their hearts by faith with thanksgiving.’ Thus, in both word and deed the fellowship meal becomes a proclamation of Christ’s death.

6.3 Participation in the meal must reflect the selflessness and service of the one whose death for us we remember and proclaim. In other words, this meal is for people of repentance and faith, who have forgiven others their sins because they have received forgiveness from God. Furthermore, all should conduct themselves at the meal in a way that honours both the Lord and those present. The meal should exhibit the unity of those who partake and our mutual concern one for another.

6.4 The fellowship meal provides a clear focus for these renovated human relationships brought into being by the death of Jesus Christ and our common faith in him. Occasionally, however, an individual may claim to be a Christian and yet refuse to live as a disciple or behave properly as a member of the body of Christ. Such a person should not attend the fellowship meal until repentance is forthcoming. (1 Cor 5.11).

6.5 These recommendations may well mean that leaders in the community will need to ensure, as far as possible, that those present at the fellowship meal be made aware of what it means to take part in a worthy way. The ancient practice of the churches (adopted by historic Anglicanism) has been to ‘catechize’ in one way or other those who would participate in the ‘Lord’s Supper’. It would be helpful if some form of this practice was extended to fellowship meals as well. Such instruction need not be extensive, and could simply consist of an explanation of the purpose and basis of the meal given at the occasion itself. Nevertheless, it should at least make clear the proper context in which both true fellowship and a faithful remembrance of the Lord’s death takes place.

6.6 In certain circumstances, where the leaders of the community are aware of persistent sin or relationship breakdown, it would be wise to give advance notice of such fellowship meals. This would serve not only the obvious practical purposes, but also allow for proper pastoral care to be exercised. For example, those who for one reason or another would be uncomfortable sharing in such a meal may in good conscience absent themselves. Ideally, however, the provision of due notice will provide sufficient time for participants to be reconciled to God and/or to others, so that all might share the meal together and all might proclaim the Lord’s death.
6.7 In summary, our response to the Synod’s request is that it is appropriate for Anglican churches, and believers in general, to have a fellowship meal for the proclamation of the Lord’s death, in addition to and distinct from their sharing in the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion, as set forth in our authorised liturgies.

For the Sydney Diocesan Doctrine Commission.

M D THOMPSON
Chairman

December 2014
33/13 Domestic violence and educating clergy
(Reports from Moore Theological College and Ministry Training and Development.)

**Key points**
- In late 2013 and early 2014 Moore Theological College conducted modules for first and third year students on understanding and responding to domestic violence and will review and further develop these modules in the next year.
- In 2014 Ministry Training and Development ran a session focused on domestic violence as part of the training of newly ordained clergy. This is seen as the beginning of a more detailed treatment of this important pastoral issue.
- In May 2015 Moore Theological College approved a Domestic Violence Policy to protect and promote the safety of all members of the College community.

**Purpose**
1. To provide progress reports from Moore Theological College and Ministry Training and Development about the approach taken in educating ordinands and clergy about domestic violence and how to respond when domestic violence comes up as an issue in marriage (and other relationships).

**Recommendation**
2. Synod receive this report.

**Background**
3. At its session in October 2013, the Synod passed resolution 33/13 –

   “Synod requests Moore College and Ministry Training and Development, in consultation with the Safe Ministry Board and appropriate experts as required, having reviewed the input they already provide, to investigate and, if needed, develop an effective approach to educating ordinands and clergy in regards to domestic violence and how to respond when it comes up as an issue in marriage (and other relationships).

   In such training, consideration ought to be given to ensuring that upholding the Bible’s good teaching on submission and sacrificial love – both in preaching and teaching, and in marriage education and counselling – is not easily twisted as a cover for abuse.

   Synod requests that Moore College and Ministry Training and Development report back with a progress report by the next session of Synod.”

4. Set out in Schedules 1 and 2 are the respective progress reports from Moore Theological College and Ministry Training and Development in response to resolution 33/13.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ROBERT WICKS
_Diocesan Secretary_
1 May 2015

---

**Schedule 1**

**Report from Moore Theological College**

**Background**
A progress report of investigations and actions at Moore College follows. It has been updated from that which was submitted too late to be included in the Synod papers in 2014.

**The Present Situation**
An investigation into the College’s teaching on understanding and dealing with domestic violence revealed the following –

- Over the years there has been input on domestic violence in ministry courses but in recent times this topic has not been part of the formal program in ministry or theology subjects.
There is no program for formally engaging on the matter of domestic violence in the pastoral care setting of chaplaincy groups.

Both the Christian Thought and Ministry Departments teach modules on the relationships between men and women, expressly calling upon men to surrender their lives in the service of their wives.

Questions concerning domestic violence have occasionally been asked of chaplains by students and these have been answered on a case-by-case basis.

Domestic violence has been addressed in some of the electives and seminars run by the Priscilla & Aquila Centre.

The responsibility of husbands to sacrificially love their wives is addressed in some of the marriage enrichment seminars run for students and spouses at College.

**Steps Undertaken as a result of Synod Resolution 33/13**

- In late 2013 and early 2014 the Ministry Department sought advice and input from psychologists and clergy with some expertise in relation to domestic violence.
- An introductory module on understanding the prevalence, consequences and hidden nature of domestic violence was conducted by Genevieve Cribb, a psychologist and concerned practitioner in this area, for first year students.
- A module on understanding domestic violence and ministering to victims and perpetrators was conducted with year 3 students by Nicola Lock, a practicing psychologist with expertise in this area.
- A policy on domestic violence for the Moore College Community has been developed (see Appendix).

**Further steps to be taken by Moore College in the next year**

- Review and further develop the input on domestic violence to 1st and 3rd year students to ensure that students are well prepared to deal with matters of domestic violence.
- Consider whether a resource on domestic violence should be developed for chaplains to use with individuals and chaplaincy groups.
- Review of the Ministry Department modules on complementarianism and explore whether they may be enhanced to uphold the Bible’s good teaching on submission and sacrificial love.

For and on behalf of Moore Theological College.

ARCHIE POULOS  
*Head of the Department of Ministry*

19 May 2015

---

### Appendix

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Dean of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superseded Documents</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>Review commencement date 19 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Documents</td>
<td>Moore College Vision, Mission &amp; Values; Domestic Violence Procedure; Faculty Handbook; Student Handbook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Endorsed By</th>
<th>Approved By</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td>19 May 2015</td>
<td>19 May 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**

The purpose of this policy is to protect and promote the safety of all members of the College community. Domestic violence is contrary to the biblical pattern of mutual love and care of each other in marriage, anchored in the example of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is also contrary to the College’s published values of integrity and community. For this reason a policy that seeks to strengthen healthy marriages and family life, denounces domestic violence, and provides help, support and the possibility of a way out of the situation
for victims (while acting with concern for the one who has acted violently as well) is entirely consistent with the College’s Vision, Mission and Values.¹

Background
The College is a Christian academic community which seeks to promote the welfare, safety and flourishing of each member. As a community made up of many families, one means to this end is to promote and strengthen marriage and family life. It is particularly important that the College seeks to ensure that our homes be places of safety, encouragement and a generous treatment of each other. Domestic violence of any kind is inexcusable. It is a violation of the love that God expects to characterize the relationship of husbands and wives, and is harmful to children. Furthermore, some types of domestic violence, such as stalking and physical and sexual assault, are crimes.

Domestic violence is commonly hidden and it is often a reflection of serious dysfunction in a marriage relationship. Many victims feel intense shame and see no way of escape. In a tight-knit community like that of the College, it is not always easy to identify those who can provide help and assistance, and, if appropriate, the encouragement and support to approach the police or other relevant authorities. A published and easily accessible policy which makes clear the College’s absolute refusal to tolerate violence in any form and in any context, particularly in the home, and which provides a means of getting help and support when faced with domestic violence, assists in promoting an atmosphere of safety and encouraging the freedom to speak out.

Scope
This policy applies to all Faculty (including Emeritus and Visiting Faculty), Chaplains, and students.

Policy Statement
1. The College seeks to promote healthy and flourishing marriages and families within its communal life.
2. Every person associated with the College has a right to expect to live in a context of safety and care which is free of domestic violence.
3. No form of domestic violence is ever justified. Such behaviour is contrary to the standards of conduct required of disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ, the College’s published Values, the Sydney diocesan code of conduct (*Faithfulness in Service*). It may also be against the law of New South Wales.
4. The College does not tolerate, overlook or conceal any instance of domestic violence within the families which make up the College community.
5. Where the College becomes aware of domestic violence within the College community:
   a. the victim(s) will be encouraged to seek help and support. This assistance will not be limited to pastoral care channels that exist within the College community. Where appropriate the victim will be encouraged and supported to seek professional help. Where the domestic violence constitutes criminal conduct, the victim(s) will also be encouraged to report the matter to the police.
   b. the person who has acted violently will be required to meet with the Dean of Students (if a student) or the Principal (if a member of the faculty or a chaplain) in the first instance to discuss the appropriate course of action and may be required to show cause to the Principal why he or she should be allowed to continue as a member of the College community, complete their studies, or continue in their role as a member of the Faculty or a chaplain. Such a person will also be encouraged to seek professional help and support as necessary.
6. The College will publish this policy, along with contact details for professional assistance regarding domestic violence, on its website and in orientation materials provided to all students at the commencement of their studies and to faculty members and chaplains when they are appointed. This will be done in a way which ensures, as far as possible, that spouses are made aware of the policy and this provision as well. This is intended to provide an avenue for professional help outside the authority structures of the College and the Diocese for those who seek it.
7. Those with pastoral oversight in the College community (Faculty and Chaplains) are to be trained in recognising and responding to domestic violence. This training will be offered to others (e.g. faculty spouses) who may find it useful.

¹ The Vision and Mission and Values of the College can be located at [http://www.moore.edu.au/vision-mission-values](http://www.moore.edu.au/vision-mission-values)
8. Those studying at the College for Diplomas or Bachelor Degrees will be trained in recognising and responding to Domestic Violence, since the majority of these students will exercise some form of pastoral ministry upon graduating.

9. The Dean of Students is responsible for ensuring that this policy is publicised throughout the College community and that the published contact details provided remain current.

10. The Dean of Students is also responsible for providing pastoral care within the College community, coordinating the training mentioned in (8) above and ensuring professional help is provided where necessary.

**Legal and Policy Framework**


*Crimes (Domestic and Personal Violence) Act 2007 (NSW).*

**Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Domestic violence is violence, abuse or intimidating behaviour by an adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>against a current or former spouse or partner, to control and dominate them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It can include (but is not limited to) intimidation, harassment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional/psychological abuse, financial abuse, stalking, social and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>geographical isolation, physical assault and sexual assault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the College</td>
<td>Faculty, chaplains and students comprise the membership of the College.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation**

The Dean of Students is responsible for the development, implementation and review of this policy.

**Acknowledgements**

*Hot Topics: Domestic Violence, Issue 87, 2013, Legal Information Access Centre, State Library of NSW*


**Schedule 2**

**Report from Ministry Training and Development**

**Background**

The current mission statement of Ministry Training and Development is –

“Ministry Training & Development exists to help multiply the number of well-trained persons (be they ordained, lay, full-time, part-time and voluntary) who are lovingly dedicated to the creation and development of ministries be they parishes, congregations and fellowships by proclaiming the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

Our work involves recruiting, selecting and training gospel ministers. In the training component, the primary focus is on training new ordinands in their first three years of full-time ministry in our Ministry Development Program, though we also provide some training opportunities for all church workers including the Ministry Intensive, Marriage Enrichment Weekends and Prepare/Enrich marriage preparation training.

Our Ministry Development Program consists of seven training days each year and one live in conference. The program seeks to help integrate theological understanding and best ministry practice and has recently focused on topics like evangelism, edification, people/social issues, prayer, safe ministry, proclamation and equipping.

In January this year we commenced a review of our work to ensure it continues to serve the mission of our church as well as it can.

**A Preliminary Response**

In the Ministry Development Program each year one or two of the seven training days focuses on how we conduct safe ministry in our churches and how we respond to important social issues theologially and pastorally. Last year we ran a session focused on domestic violence with a presentation from Canon Sandy Grant. Sandy outlined the problem of domestic violence, provided some helpful guidelines for those with
pastoral responsibility in responding to a person who is experiencing violence, looked at some relevant scriptures and discussed how we might teach on marriage in a way that could not be twisted to sanction domestic violence.

This is seen as the beginning of a more detailed treatment of this important pastoral issue that effects people in our churches and local communities. We are currently talking with clergy, psychologists, counsellors and lawyers who have expertise in dealing with domestic violence and its impacts on people. In the future we hope to have this issue addressed as a vital part of our program for all participants. In particular we will seek to –

- Highlight the extent of the problem, look at the complex issues involved including some of the reasons why it occurs and the environments in which it can flourish
- Outline the far reaching and profound effects domestic violence has particularly on family members but also on friends, churches and the community
- Give clear instruction on the biblical teaching on marriage and family life including headship and submission in marriage (making it clear that this in no way ever justifies domestic violence)
- Discuss how the biblical pattern can be taught in a parish context in a way that is not susceptible to being used to sanction violence in any way
- Discuss together how a church worker can listen sensitively and respond appropriately to complaints of domestic violence, providing a process of dealing with the issue
- Make available a list of people, resources and services that can provide help and advice in dealing with this complex problem

We would seek to provide this training using well qualified professional people and hope to make it more widely available to church workers across the Diocese.

For and on behalf of Ministry Training and Development.

GARY O’BRIEN
Director

9 April 2015
Review of the Ethical Investment Policy

(A report from the Glebe Administration Board.)

Purpose
1. The purpose of this paper is to inform the Synod of the work being undertaken by Glebe Administration Board (“GAB”) to review the ethical investment policy for the investment of the property of the Diocesan Endowment having regard, particularly, to resolution 22/14 of the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney which deals with investments in companies involved in the gambling industry and resolution 61/14 of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia which deals with climate change and investments in the fossil fuel industry.

Recommendation
2. Synod receive this report.

Background
3. It is timely to review the ethical investment policy for the Diocesan Endowment, particularly in light of resolution 22/14 of the Synod (which deals with investments in companies involved in gambling) and resolution 61/14 of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia (which deals with climate change and investments in the fossil fuel industry).

4. In reviewing its ethical investment policy GAB has sought the advice of its asset consultant, Mercer, and the Social Issues Committee. It has reviewed the relevant policies of organisations with a similar investment philosophy to GAB. GAB has prepared a draft revised policy which –
   - generally retains the “negative” screens (that is the “disapproved businesses”) set out in the current policy and proposes 2 other “negative” screens, and
   - proposes a positive statement as to the behaviour by companies which GAB seeks to encourage and will take into account in determining whether an investment is made or retained, and
   - proposes an approach to investments in companies which derive revenue from gambling which is a modification of the criteria expressed by the Synod in resolution 22/14, and
   - in relation to climate change and investments in the fossil fuel industry, proposes a policy which has regard to the carbon intensity of the portfolio as a whole and states an intention to reduce that intensity over time in accordance with pre-determined targets.

5. The current ethical investment policy contains “negative” screens which prohibit investments in a fund which conducts a “disapproved business” or invests mainly in the securities of a corporation or a fund which conducts a “disapproved business”. A “disapproved business” is a business involved in armaments, tobacco, gambling or betting, liquor or pornography.

6. It is proposed that the current negative screens be retained, but that they be extended to cover stem cell research involving the destruction of embryos and abortifacient and abortifacient-like contraceptives.

7. It is also proposed to include in the policy a positive statement to the effect that GAB will seek to encourage ethical and responsible behaviour by companies and compliance with appropriate legal, labour, social, environmental, stewardship and governance standards, and will take into account the extent to which an investment in a company or a managed fund will further this objective in assessing whether that investment is made or maintained.

8. By resolution 22/14, the Synod requested that Anglican organisations divest themselves of any investments in any company whose revenue from gambling exceeds either 10% of revenue or $50 million per annum. The proposed policy incorporates the substance of the Synod’s request in so far as it includes the threshold of 10% of revenue from gambling in the “negative” screens. The threshold of $50 million per annum in revenue from gambling has not been included as it is considered to be unworkable from an implementation viewpoint.

9. In relation to climate change, many of the organisations with a similar general ethical investment philosophy to GAB have adopted a divestment approach in relation to fossil fuel industries. By this approach those organisations will not invest in a company, or maintain an investment, if the company derives a threshold amount of its annual revenue (commonly, 20%) from activities involving or related to fossil fuels. This is the approach advocated by the General Synod in resolution 61/14.

10. However, rather than a divestment approach, GAB proposes to measure the carbon “footprint” of the portfolio, and commit to reduce that “footprint” over time in accordance with pre-determined targets. This
approach is similar to that adopted by the University of Sydney in relation to its equity investments. The University has a significant investment portfolio which is invested on ethical grounds.

11. GAB has asked its investment consultant to provide advice about how the proposed policy can be implemented and the impact of the policy, if adopted, on the forecast return and risk profiles of the Diocesan Endowment and future distributions from those funds.

12. It is intended that the draft policy be reviewed by GAB in light of such advice, prior to the adoption of the policy. In due course it is proposed that the revised policy, when adopted by GAB will be submitted to the Standing Committee for its ratification prior to implementation. It is expected that a revised policy will be adopted and ratified late in 2015 or early in 2016.

13. The work being undertaken by GAB to review its ethical investment policy is being undertaken in conjunction with Anglican Church Property Trust Diocese of Sydney which is reviewing the ethical investment policy applying to the investment of its Long Term Pooling Fund.

For and on behalf of the Glebe Administration Board

MARK PAYNE
Chief Executive Officer

15 September 2015
Large Property Receipts Policy

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

Key points
- Synod approved the Large Property Receipts Policy in principle at its last session in October 2014 and asked the Standing Committee to consult with parishes and bring a revised form of the policy for consideration at the 2015 session of Synod.
- The Standing Committee has prepared a revised form of policy which, among other things, increases the large property receipts thresholds in the policy and provides that the Standing Committee will be guided by the parish in determining its reasonable property needs.
- However a property receipts levy may be preferable to a Large Property Receipts Policy and accordingly the Synod will be asked whether it wishes the Standing Committee to undertake further work on a levy for consideration by the Synod no later than its 2020 session.

Purpose
1. The purpose of this report is to provide recommendations to the Synod regarding a revised form of the Large Property Receipts Policy (“LPRP”) and the alternative of a Property Receipts Levy.

Recommendations
2. The Synod receive this report.
3. The Synod pass the following motion to be moved at the forthcoming session of Synod “by request of Standing Committee” –

   ‘Synod –
   (i) noting the Large Property Receipts Policy (“LPRP”) approved in principle at its last session in October 2014,
   (ii) noting its request that the Standing Committee consult with parishes about the LPRP with a view to bringing a revised form to this session,
   (iii) noting the revised form of the LPRP included in the Standing Committee’s report to Synod on this matter (“Report”) together with an outline of a possible Property Receipts Levy as an alternative to the LPRP,
   (iv) noting that during the consultation process there appeared to be a preference for a form of Property Receipts Levy instead of a LPRP,

(a) agrees that a Property Receipts Levy along the lines described in the Report may be preferable to a LPRP, and therefore requests the Standing Committee to collect the necessary financial data from parishes, and undertake the necessary modelling and further consultation to bring to the Synod no later than its session in 2020 a proposal for a Property Receipts Levy to replace the LPRP, and

(b) in the meantime –
   (i) resolves to resume forthwith consideration of the LPRP in the revised form, with a view to finalising the LPRP as a policy of the Synod pending the Synod’s consideration of a form of Property Receipts Levy in its place, and
   (ii) confirms that it would be appropriate to index threshold amounts in the LPRP if it were to continue beyond 2020.’

Background

Historical background
4. This Diocese has had a policy relating to large receipts since 1960, when it established a “Special Receipts Committee” in response to the following recommendation of the Property Trust –

   “That in cases where parishes are to have greatly enhanced receipts and such amounts are, in fact beyond the reasonable needs of the parish, then the surplus should be allocated for other parishes etc and/or diocesan objectives.”

5. This policy position was ultimately reflected in regulations made by the Standing Committee and became known as the Large Receipts Policy (“LRP”). The sale threshold, beyond which the policy applied,
was set at $100,000 in 1975, which was gradually increased to its current level of $500,000 in 2004. Similarly, a threshold for lease income was set at $20,000 pa in 1997 and has been increased to its current threshold of $50,000 pa (set in 2012).

6. The rationale for the LRP arises from the character of the trusts on which all property is held for every parish: church trusts are not private trusts for the benefit of individual beneficiaries or even for the group of persons who meet and exercise ministry on that property at a particular time. Rather, they are charitable trusts under which the property is devoted to designated purposes of the Diocese in perpetuity, subject to a power to vary those trusts under section 32 of the Anglican Church of Australia Trust Property Act 1917.

The current Large Receipts Policy

7. The current LRP broadly provides that where the expected sale proceeds from parish property will exceed $500,000 or where the expected lease proceeds will exceed $50,000 pa, the normal expectation is that 15% of the proceeds will be made available for the broader ministry needs of the Diocese. The policy also provides that a higher percentage may be appropriate if the large receipt from a sale exceeds $1,000,000.

8. As an indication of the volume of funds generated through the LRP, sale contributions under the LRP each year generate in the order of $450,000, although this fluctuates dramatically. Lease contributions under the LRP have contributed –

(a) an average of $1,146,000 pa over the last five years to the Synod budget, which typically forms between 20% and 25% of the Synod budget (derived largely from the contributions of four parishes – see paragraphs 22 and 25(a)), and

(b) in the order of $250,000 pa directly to other ministries in the Diocese.

9. There are several areas where the current policy has proved unsatisfactory –

(a) The sale threshold is set at such a level that almost every property sale triggers the policy.

(b) The 15% amount is presented as a flat contribution against the whole of the sale (or lease) proceeds with no provision for offsets or expenses that would reasonably be excluded from the income figure before a contribution is expected.

For various reasons, including the matter referred to in (b), it has become common when a parish submits a bill for an ordinance for lease or sale of a property, to seek a partial or full exemption from the application of the policy. This has led to a perception that the policy is applied inconsistently and therefore is unpredictable in its operation.

LPRP approved in principle at Synod in 2014

10. Out of a desire to address these problems, the Standing Committee promoted to the Synod in October 2014 a proposed LPRP. The LPRP specified that contribution amounts should only apply after the “reasonable property needs” of the parish have been met. The concept of ‘Reasonable Property Needs’ was not extensively defined in the LPRP however the LPRP contemplated that further clarity as to the meaning of reasonable property needs would be provided by guidelines prepared by the Standing Committee.

11. The LPRP also introduced progressive contribution bands for sale and lease income.

12. Although the Synod approved the LPRP in principle in October 2014, it requested that the Standing Committee consult with parishes and bring a revised form of the LPRP to the 2015 session of Synod taking into account feedback received during the consultation.

Consultations

13. As a first step in consulting with parishes, the Standing Committee invited all parishes to provide written feedback regarding the LPRP by 31 December 2014. In February 2015, following consideration of the written feedback, a subcommittee appointed by the Standing Committee met with the four parishes contributing the largest amount of lease income under the existing policy. Finally, all parishes in the Diocese were invited to participate in consultation sessions held in May 2015.

Revised Large Property Receipts Policy

14. As a result of the consultation process, the subcommittee has prepared the attached revised form of the LPRP for consideration at the 2015 session of Synod. Aside from editorial changes, the changes incorporated into the revised form are described below.

Increased large receipts thresholds

15. In response to feedback that the thresholds were too low, the thresholds have been increased from $500,000 to $1,000,000 for sales and from $50,000 to $100,000 pa for leases. [8]
16. As a consequence, the assumed minimum reasonable property needs of a parish have been increased from $500,000 to $1,000,000 for sales and $50,000 to $100,000 pa for leases. [12]

**Meaning of reasonable property needs**

17. In response to feedback indicating the need for a wider understanding of reasonable property needs, the general description of reasonable property needs of a parish has been revised to specifically refer to renovation and replacement of property, whereas previously only maintenance had been specified. [9]

**How reasonable property needs will be determined**

18. Under the previous form of LPRP, the Standing Committee was to produce guidelines to assist in identifying reasonable property needs. In the revised form, the Standing Committee will be guided by the parish in identifying its reasonable property needs. This change in approach arose out of feedback which highlighted the impracticality of Standing Committee producing workable guidelines to identify reasonable property needs. [10]

**Guidelines for contributions**

19. While feedback indicated that parishes generally felt that progressive contribution bands were advantageous as they set an expectation of proportional giving, they also resulted in several negative consequences –

(a) the prescriptive nature of the bands were perceived as likely to result in a policy that did not encourage or assume generosity in giving, and

(b) the higher end of the contribution bands were suggested to be sufficiently large so as to discourage good stewardship of the asset.

20. In response to this feedback, the revised policy –

(a) provides a guiding contribution percentage for sale and lease receipts of 15% and 30% respectively, of the amount in excess of the reasonable property needs of the parish. These contribution rates should apply to the majority of cases, [13 & 15] and

(b) indicates that a higher contribution percentage will be expected for larger amounts, so as to allow greater consideration of the appropriate contribution while also leaving room for the parish to propose a generous amount themselves. [13 & 15]

**Sunset**

21. The revised policy includes a sunset clause to ensure that the Synod has another opportunity to consider the policy in conjunction with a proposed property receipts levy as an alternative to the policy. [20]

**Property Receipts Levy**

22. During the course of the consultations, the option of a property receipts levy as an alternative to the LPRP was considered. A principle reason for considering a levy flowed from the desire to share the responsibility for contributing to Synod funded ministry among more parishes. Currently, four parishes provide 96% of lease contributions to the Synod budget. A levy would have the advantage of applying to the aggregate of all lease and licence income in a parish, which should provide for a more consistent and broader funding base than a policy.

23. The characteristics of a levy broadly proposed included that it would –

(a) apply to certain categories of income within the Property and Finance sections of each parish’s annual Prescribed Financial Statement, net of property-related expenses,

(b) be structured to ensure that the amount currently contributed to ministry needs of the wider Diocese through the existing LRP is at least replaced by funds from the levy, and

(c) likely be implemented over a transition period in order to minimise disruption to parishes and to ministries funded by the Synod.

24. The form of property receipts levy considered at the consultation sessions was primarily seen as a replacement for lease contributions under the LPRP. If the option of a levy is further developed, options considered may include –

(a) allowing a limited form of the LPRP to continue for property sales only,

(b) discontinuing any LPRP in respect of property sales and relying instead on the generosity of the parish concerned, and

(c) prescribing a means to levy a portion of sales proceeds.

25. The possible benefits of a levy include –

(a) sharing the responsibility for contributing to Synod funded ministry more broadly (currently most of the lease contributions under the LRP come from four parishes),
(b) consistency in application,
(c) treats all lease and licence income as an aggregate within a parochial unit,
(d) provides opportunity to establish a contribution-free threshold and successive contribution bands that represent the will of the Synod with regard to proportional giving,
(e) may incorporate a requirement or an incentive for parishes to set aside funds for future property maintenance and improvement as an encouragement to good stewardship, and
(f) is administratively simple.

26. During the consultation sessions there appeared to be a preference for a levy as opposed to a LPRP.

Next Steps

27. The subcommittee believes that a property receipts levy may be preferable to an LPRP. However, shifting from a policy to a levy is a significant change requiring careful analysis and modelling. It also requires information from parishes regarding property maintenance expenses that is not currently collected.

28. The subcommittee therefore considered that an appropriate way forward would be for the Synod to adopt the revised form of the LPRP (including a sunset clause of 2020) and ask the Standing Committee to collect the necessary financial data, and undertake the necessary modelling and further consultation, to bring a proposal for a Property Receipts Levy back to the Synod by 2020 as a possible replacement to the LPRP.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

CRAIG ROBERTS
Subcommittee Chair
20 July 2015
Large Property Receipts Policy

Church Trust Property

1. Property is "church trust property" if it is subject to any trust for the use, benefit or purposes of the Anglican Church in the Diocese of Sydney or any parochial unit or diocesan organisation in the Diocese.

2. All church trust property in this Diocese has been donated to trustees, or has been acquired with money placed in the hands of trustees, for the purposes of parochial units or diocesan organisations or for specific or general purposes within the Diocese.

3. Church trusts are not private trusts for the benefit of individual beneficiaries but are charitable trusts under which the property (subject to the power to vary those trusts under section 32 of the Anglican Church of Australia Trust Property Act 1917) is devoted to designated purposes in perpetuity. It is not held on trust solely for a group of persons who may have the right to use it for the time being and the obligation to maintain it.

Rationale for this policy

4. The Synod considers that it is the responsibility of each parish to ensure, as far as possible, that its reasonable property needs for effectively undertaking ministry are met.

5. The Synod recognises that in order to meet a parish’s reasonable property needs it is sometimes necessary or desirable to sell or lease church trust property held for the parish.

6. The Synod also recognises that sometimes the sale and leasing of parish property will give rise to a large property receipt which is beyond the reasonable property needs of the parish.

7. In these circumstances, the Synod considers that a portion of the large property receipt in excess of the reasonable property needs of the parish should be shared with the rest of the Diocese.

When does this policy apply?

8. This policy will only apply if there is a large property receipt. For the purposes of this policy, a large property receipt will arise if –
   (a) the net sale proceeds of parish property is expected to exceed $1,000,000, or
   (b) the net leasing income from parish property is expected to exceed $100,000 pa.

What are the reasonable property needs of a parish?

9. The reasonable property needs of a parish means that combination of land, buildings and associated infrastructure (and the means to maintain, renovate or replace such property) as is reasonably required by the parish to effectively undertake its ministry both currently and into the foreseeable future.

10. The Standing Committee will be guided by the parish in identifying its reasonable property needs.

Promotion of bills which give rise to a large property receipt

11. The statement of evidence accompanying a bill for the sale or lease of parish property which gives rise to a large property receipt should identify the reasonable property needs of the parish. If those reasonable property needs are currently not met –
   (a) the statement of evidence should also include a plan to ensure the parish meets those needs, and
   (b) the bill should provide, as a first priority, for the application of the large property receipt in or toward meeting those needs in accordance with that plan and in conformity with any policy of the Standing Committee concerning the application of sale proceeds and property income.
12. If a bill for a sale or lease of parish property gives rise to a large property receipt and –
   (a) the reasonable property needs identified by the parish are less than the amount of the large
       property receipt, or
   (b) the parish does not adequately identify or plan to meet its reasonable property needs,
       the amount necessary to meet the reasonable property needs of the parish is, for the purposes of
       this policy, taken to be $1,000,000 in the case of a bill to sell parish property and $100,000 pa in the
       case of a bill to lease parish property.

Sharing with the rest of the Diocese

13. The Synod’s normal expectation for a large property receipt arising from a bill for an ordinance to sell
    parish property is that the parish should share 15% of any amount in excess of its reasonable
    property needs with the Mission Property Committee as an addition to the Mission Property Fund. If
    the excess is expected to be greater than $500,000, the percentage shared should be higher than
    15%.

14. Any preference that the parish wishes to express concerning the application of a large property
    receipts payment to a particular Mission Property Committee project should be expressed in the
    Statement of Evidence which accompanies the bill rather than in the bill itself.

15. The Synod’s normal expectation for a large property receipt arising from a bill for an ordinance to
    lease parish property is that the parish should share 30% of any amount in excess of its reasonable
    property needs with the Synod for allocation as part of its annual budgeting process or, upon special
    application, with other Diocesan beneficiaries. If the excess is expected to be greater than $50,000
    pa, the percentage shared should be higher than 30%.

Review of bills for large property receipts ordinances

16. A bill for an ordinance which gives rise to a large property receipt but is promoted on the basis that
    the reasonable property needs identified by the parish are less than the amount of the large property
    receipt (under paragraph 12(a) above) will not usually be referred to an Ordinance Review Panel
    provided the bill makes provision for the sharing of a portion of the large property receipt in
    accordance with the normal expectations of the Synod under this policy.

Grant of relief from policy

17. The Standing Committee will consider any request for relief (in part or whole) from the sharing of a
    portion of a large property receipt in accordance with the normal expectation of the Synod under this
    policy. Such relief will not be granted unless the promoters of a bill involving a large property receipt
    give sufficient reasons for an exception.

Reports concerning amounts shared under the policy

18. A report will be provided to the Synod each year identifying all amounts shared under this policy with
    the Mission Property Fund and other diocesan beneficiaries in the preceding year and with the Synod
    for allocation as part of its budget in the following year.

Amendment of the policy

19. The Standing Committee may make amendments to this policy provided such amendments are
    reported to the next ordinary session of the Synod.

Sunset

20. This policy ceases to operate on the first day of the ordinary session of the Synod in 2020.
33/14 Ministry progress and brownfields’ grants

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

Key points

- The presence of strong leadership and the number of newcomers is critical to parish numerical growth, but well-timed property development to accommodate growth is demonstrably important to stimulate sustained growth, particularly in parishes with an average adult attendance of ‘over 200’.

- Consequently, the ability to fund property development is a key factor in a parish’s ability to grow. Yet, the funding issues are difficult for many parishes to navigate.

- As a diocese, we should consider ways to provide funding to brownfield churches that fit a profile conducive for growth.

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to respond to Synod’s request in resolution 33/14 to investigate what conclusions can be drawn from ministry progress and related experiences resulting from the Brownfield grants made by the Diocese in 2007.

Recommendations

2. Synod receive this report.

3. Synod pass the following motion to be moved at Synod “by request of the Standing Committee” – “Synod gives thanks to God for the contribution of $9.32m from the Diocesan Endowment in stimulating some $43m in parish building projects, which has facilitated enhanced new ministry opportunities, measured by notable increased attendance and offertory growth in a number of those churches.

Further, noting –

(i) the report regarding Ministry Progress and Brownfields grants, and

(ii) that 70% of the growth in new housing in Sydney is anticipated to be in brownfield areas, and

(iii) the urgent desire to introduce Jesus to more people,

Synod requests that Standing Committee, in consultation with the Strategic Research Group and any other necessary parties, develop –

(a) recommendations for Synod 2016 as to how capital could be raised for the development and expansion of church facilities in brownfield areas, and

(b) appropriate criteria that could be used to ascertain suitable and strategic parishes to receive such an investment.”

Background

4. A focus of our Diocese in recent times has been developing new church sites in greenfield areas. The needs and opportunities for the Gospel are vast, and the oft noted observation that land must be purchased at the inception of a greenfield project is not to be taken lightly, as the costs of retrospectively establishing church sites are prohibitive. For this reason, the Synod introduced a Greenfields levy of 2.24% from 2013 to fund the purchase of land for church sites in greenfield areas.

5. However, in a context where Sydney is constrained somewhat by natural boundaries, 70% of the growth of Sydney is projected to be in brownfield areas.1 Acknowledging this reality and the support needed for existing churches, in 2007 a one-off distribution of $20m was made from the Diocesan Endowment, with a significant portion ($9.32m) used to provide grants to selected brownfield Churches for property development.

---

1 In the 2010 Metropolitan Plan for Sydney, the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure aimed to “locate at least 70% of new homes in existing suburbs and up to 30% in greenfield areas” (Department of Planning and Infrastructure (2010). Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036, December 2010 p.11. Accessed online, 3 January 2014). The NSW Government is no longer explicit in their targets in this kind of way (the updated 2014 Metropolitan Plan for Sydney contains no explicit targets). Nonetheless, the explicit 2010 ‘70:30’ benchmark is regarded as the best available.
At its session in October 2014, the Synod passed resolution 33/14 –

“Synod rejoices in the ministry progress of the 10 brownfields churches which received grants from the $20 million taken out of the Diocesan Endowment last decade for various church building projects, and Synod gives thanks to God for the 28% growth in church members in total for the 9 of those churches which have reliable attendance statistics spanning the years 2004 to 2013, lifting diocesan offertories in 2013 by $2,722,588 more than what was received by those 9 churches in total in 2004 (121% increase in offertories from those 9 churches).

Synod requests the Standing Committee to investigate what conclusions can be drawn from these statistics, including whether adequate church building facilities is an important strategy in assisting growing brownfields churches to grow further and introduce Jesus to more people, and whether more resources raised from parishes and/or the Diocesan Endowment, and then applied to similar projects that the $20 million was applied to, will assist further and accelerate growth in church attendance across the Diocese. Synod further requests that Standing Committee’s investigation be reported to the Synod in 2015, together with any possible recommendations flowing from the investigation on how more capital funds could be raised for brownfields church building enhancement projects.”

The first paragraph of the resolution notes the significant aggregate growth of these parishes over the 2004 - 2013 period. The second paragraph asks Standing Committee to investigate what conclusions can be drawn from the growth of those parishes who benefited from the Diocesan grant in 2007, and make recommendations to further the work of the gospel in response. Standing Committee referred consideration of the resolution, and in particular the requests of the second paragraph, to the Strategic Research Group (“SRG”).

Analysis

The SRG notes that 70% of the population growth of Sydney will occur in brownfield areas. The purpose of this investigation is to explore the relationship between building activity and church growth. It is widely acknowledged as naïve to attribute growth solely to building programs. At the same time, it is equally naïve to discount the role of facilities in enabling a church to provide ministry activities that in turn facilitate growth. For example, one rector interviewed during the course of this investigation, testified: ‘the story of our main morning service is that the plateau we addressed unsuccessfully throughout the last decade with church plants has been broken through with a building program.’

Process of analysis

While the starting point for analysis is to understand better the impact of the grant money and the building development on those parishes that received brownfields grants, the key goal was to determine whether the growth of these parishes is demonstrably connected to their building program, and if so, to identify if possible at what point in a parish’s growth a building redevelopment is most impactful for the sustained growth of the parish. Subsidiary goals include identifying the key characteristics of parishes who are most likely to benefit from building works, and developing creative ways of helping them to do so.

The following table lists the recipients of the brownfields grant distribution, showing both the brownfields grant value as well as the total cost of the project that was stimulated –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Total ($)</th>
<th>Synod Funding ($)</th>
<th>Project Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>2,400K</td>
<td>1,000K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn, St Thomas</td>
<td>500K</td>
<td>450K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berowra</td>
<td>3,000K</td>
<td>900K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>18,500K</td>
<td>1,750K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapto</td>
<td>3,300K</td>
<td>1,100K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmore Park</td>
<td>2,400K</td>
<td>900K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoxton Park</td>
<td>5,280K</td>
<td>1,400K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrickville</td>
<td>280K</td>
<td>170K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naremburn/Cammeray</td>
<td>3,900K</td>
<td>500K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooty Hill</td>
<td>3,500K</td>
<td>1,150K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43,060K</td>
<td>9,320K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. As a starting point, growth statistics (finances and attendance) were analysed from the parishes who received a grant, with particular consideration given to the point in time at which their building program occurred. As a next step, where possible, the rectors from those parishes were interviewed to ascertain their views on the impact of their now complete building program. Having noticed some trends among these parishes (discussed below), the statistical growth in attendance and giving of these grant-receivers was compared with other parishes who had similar sized building programs to identify which trends continued to hold true. Finally, all parishes in the Diocese who experienced significant growth (regardless of the presence of a building program) were analysed in an effort to isolate the impact of a building program on growth. The results are discussed below.

Initial reflections

12. Delving into the parish-specific data, beyond the merely aggregated level, is helpful. In particular, reviewing the impact of building development on parishes with larger numbers of adult attenders, and comparing these with the impact of building development on parishes with smaller numbers of adult attenders, is revealing. Prima facie at least, the impact of building development appears more notable in the parishes with an average attendance of over 200 adults.

13. To summarise the conversations with respective parishes –

- **Rooty Hill** spoke about the significant impact almost overnight of ‘having a footprint and visibility in the community’ that they previously lacked. The Appendix A statistics for their growth since building speak for themselves. Their growth has been spearheaded by their Families Ministry, and tracing the long term development of their Family Congregation(s) is striking. The building opened in 2010, and in 2013 the Family Congregation outgrew the new facilities. With weekly adult attendance well over 300, this work was then replicated and continued to grow, in God’s kindness. Three other factors are also worth noting: the long term leadership of the rector; the unique Children’s Ministry under a talented leader; and the adoption of the ‘purpose driven’ church model. The rector said it would have been borderline as to whether or not Rooty Hill would have embarked on its building program without the help of the Diocese.

- **Broadway** was almost forced into the Diocese’s largest ever building program (over $18m), following the fire at Broadway in 2006. Significant attendance growth has followed: as of 2015, they had grown by almost 50% since the fire. In no small part, this is due to the planting of a new afternoon Mandarin-speaking congregation (and pastor). And while this might have been otherwise achievable, the rector is of the view that the modern design of the building is particularly appealing for the demographic they are trying to reach. Furthermore, it provided ‘social spaces,’ enabling Broadway to now do mid-size ministries better than ever before. In fact, the new facilities have become a ‘thriving community centre,’ and are used 8am-10pm most days of the week.

- **Dapto** testified to the significant growth in its primary family congregation (147 adults in 2009 to 226 adults in 2014, plus children) that the new facilities enabled, under God. But the macro statistics are offset by issues in some of the other (including offsite) congregations or ‘unsuccessful’ church plants. It is still a parish that is spread over 3 sites, but its primary Family Congregation has been able to break through its previous capacity constraints, as demonstrated by the final table in Appendix A. Interestingly, Dapto’s family congregation, on 2014 data, is now the fifth largest Sunday morning congregation in the Diocese, and one of only 11 in the Diocese with over 200 adult attendees. The Rector believes that the size of the car park is providing a new constraint, highlighting the importance of holistic site development.

- **Naremburn-Cammeray** embarked on a $3.5m building program that was completed in 2010. They probably would have proceeded without Diocesan assistance, but it was acknowledged that they were able to leverage off 8 congregations across two primary centres, while enjoying unique socio-economic factors that enabled them to raise the necessary funds. The facilities have now enabled the capacity to increase, and various ministries now have a ‘home’ and visibility that they previously lacked. For example, the youth ministry previously ‘did not have a home.’ Furthermore, there was an enormous cohesive benefit in bringing the staff together from working in their homes to a central office. While the old facilities hindered ministries, the new facilities enabled more ministries to occur, and to do so simultaneously. Naremburn’s primary Family Congregation has increased from a plateau of around 80-90, and in 2014 was at 160 adults plus children. They are now in the process of redeveloping their Cammeray site.

- **Glenmore Park** in the Western suburbs was able to internally raise $250-300K toward the $2.3M project. Having no land to sell, the Rector was adamant that there is ‘no way’ that they would have been able to do it without the Diocese’s $900K grant, and also assistance to secure
the almost $1.2m loan with the Finance and Loans Board. The project has allowed the parish to break through the ‘glass ceiling’ resulting from an auditorium that struggled to seat 150. On special Sundays, they have now had over 700 adults across a Sunday. They are now operating in a new church size ‘bracket,’ with the re-development also encompassing a number of small meeting rooms that enable multiple and simultaneous ministries to function across the week.

- **Berowra** has seen 37% growth over the 3 years since the completion of its building program. Even allowing for the attendance reduction in the year of building, this growth is notable. What is even more interesting is that the $2.9m building program did not increase the size of their main meeting area. Instead, it focused on the associated facilities that has enhanced many ministries. While the rector’s instinct is that the growth has been primarily ‘switchers’ (as confirmed in the NCLS 2011 statistics), it is noteworthy that their newcomer levels were above the Diocesan average in the period preceding the building program.

- **Hoxton Park**, it could be argued, is more of a greenfield development than a brownfield one. The project entailed a 600 seat auditorium, while the existing congregations at the time were each approximately 75 adults. The rector advised that some challenges on the ministry front have held things back, while the high recurring costs required to run larger facilities have been a drain on the smaller congregations. While the morning family congregation has grown to approximately 110 adults plus children, one wonders, in retrospect, if the $4.8m total construction cost was a little ambitious in scale. There is an annual estimated cost of $60K to keep the building running; while the staff do what they can to compensate for having small congregations in a vast physical space, and while there is some advantage in having a good venue for regional events, perhaps the scale was too big for the congregations at the time. A lesson could be the need to suitably scale facilities, considering the size of the congregations at the time.

- **Marrickville** was not able to be invited to participate due to time constraints.

- The investment in **Annandale** has not seen the same kind of fruit as those in medium to larger parishes. The Rector attributes this to a variety of distractions at the time.

- **Auburn** was not contacted directly in connection with this report. Their project was of their hall at the back of their facility. No congregation was previously at its capacity in their main auditorium (which admittedly, was run down).

**Statistical summary**

14. The following table provides a statistical comparison of the parishes receiving Diocesan grants with offertory growth and adult attendance (over and under 200 adults). We acknowledge the desirability of including youth and children in these statistics. However, the reliability of the lodged statistics for ‘under 18’s varied too significantly to allow this to be done consistently and reliably. As an alternative, such factors were raised in the initial interviews with respective rectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 200 parishes</th>
<th>Over 200 parishes (ex Broadway)</th>
<th>Broadway</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since 2008, offertory growth in 2013 ($)</td>
<td>239K</td>
<td>1,434K</td>
<td>47K</td>
<td>1,720K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Grant ($)</td>
<td>3,020K</td>
<td>4,550K</td>
<td>1,750K</td>
<td>9,320K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Return on investment’ in 2013</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated Building Project Value ($)</td>
<td>8,460K</td>
<td>16,100K</td>
<td>18,500K</td>
<td>41,860K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple of grant</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance growth 2007 - 2014 Adults</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>+ 558</td>
<td>+141</td>
<td>+ 633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. This data shows that while the ‘under 200’ parishes had an 8% ‘return on investment’ (ROI) in 2013, the attendance of these parishes was static or declined.\(^2\) By comparison, the ‘over 200’ parishes saw a significantly greater ROI as well as strong attendance growth.

16. In addition, we note that the average level of ‘Newcomers’ at the ‘over 200’ parishes was 12.4%, against a Diocesan average of 9.3%. Indeed, five of the six ‘over 200’ parishes had newcomer levels above the Diocesan average. The NCLS ‘Newcomer’ statistic is taken from the latest available NCLS survey (2011) and is an objective measure to capture the percentage of a church population that was not active at any church five years previously. As such, it is the closest available measure for conversion growth and is one of the key metrics for progress against our Mission 2020 goals.\(^3\)

17. We may further observe that the average rate of ‘transfer growth’ (those who have joined a particular parish and were part of another Anglican or non-Anglican church 5 years prior) was 29% across Diocesan churches. There is overlap between this statistic and the reality that 39% of Australians (aged 5 and over) reported a change of address from five years earlier in the 2011 Census. So, while there may be other factors that contribute to transfer growth (such as the desire for a perceived vibrant youth group when one’s children become teenagers), levels similar to those observed would be expected as a reflection of the normal shift in population.

**Apparent trends**

18. It is tempting to formulate strategy and draw conclusions based on particular anecdotes. Certainly, we must heed the warnings and lessons from each, but at the same time we must form conclusions and observe trends from the combined picture. From this investigation, encompassing interviews with the parishes listed above, as well as detailed consideration of parish statistics and building development information from across the Diocese, we may observe the following trends –

   (a) Facilities development has been a significant contributing factor to attendance growth in ‘over 200’ parishes, particularly those facing a capacity issue in one or more individual congregations. In terms of its contribution to attendance growth, facilities development seems to have less effect with ‘under 200’ parishes.

   (b) Facilities development seems to have been most effective in enabling parishes to break a recognised size barrier (such as 200 or 400). In the case of larger parishes, this dynamic has enabled the establishment of larger congregations.

   (c) Of the 21 developments larger than $1m since 2005, only 6 (North Sydney, Normanhurst, Kiama, Gymea, West Pymble and Engadine) were funded without diocesan assistance or property ‘re-deployment.’ Three out of these six were for developments that were less than $1.5m (the lower end of significant developments). The remaining three were North Sydney, Normanhurst, and Kiama. This realisation highlights the struggle that the majority of parishes in brownfield areas face (particularly those without multiple property holdings) to fund redevelopment and expansion without some kind of external assistance. For a complete analysis, refer to Appendix B.

   (d) Stable, strong and committed leadership has been in evidence where attendance growth has followed facilities development.

   (e) Strong statistical newcomer growth was in evidence before any facilities development program began, with every parish experiencing growth having above Diocesan average rates of ‘newcomers’ prior to their building program. In other words, facilities development did not create growth momentum. Rather, improved and expanded facilities accelerated pre-existing ministry effectiveness and removed barriers to further attendance growth. In particular, this was achieved by allowing diversified and multiple ministry activities (often simultaneously).

   (f) Most ‘over 200’ parishes had rates of ‘newcomers’ somewhat higher than the Diocesan average both in 2006, prior to development, and also at the last available NCLS survey, in 2011.

19. These observations are consistent with the hypothesis that smaller parishes (under 200) tend to be more relationally driven, while the larger parishes (over 200) must begin to rely more on their ability to offer a diversity of ministries, which necessitates facilities that can enable this to happen.

20. Demographic factors may also have played their part in these parishes. In the same way that greenfield sites benefit from having been intentionally developed to cater to an expected demographic change, demographic projections could inform the criteria used to prioritise Diocesan support for building

---

\(^2\) For our purposes, we have approximated the return on the diocesan investment (ROI) by taking the increase in income (i.e. parish offertories) after the building project and dividing it by the original ‘investment’ amount (i.e. the Brownfields grant).

\(^3\) The fact that one of the ‘over 200’ parishes had a 2011 Newcomers rate of 8% ought to highlight the descriptive (rather than prescriptive) nature of this report.
projects in brownfield areas. Consider the impact of 70% of the growth of Sydney occurring in brownfield areas: there will be an increase of density across the board with sizable pockets of Sydney experiencing substantial urban renewal. A coordinated approach involving greenfield sites, brownfields development and activities of the likes of Evangelism and New Churches, should provide the greatest potential under God to deliver the optimal strategic outcome.

21. This investigation has not looked in detail at every parish that has conducted a facilities development program (with or without diocesan assistance). In some cases, the completion of the development is too recent to make conclusive observations (for example, Chatswood, Neutral Bay, and Bowral). That said, the completion of the Lower Mountains (made possible because of land re-deployment) and Normanhurst developments, without brownfield grants, is consistent with these observations. In the case of Lower Mountains, the facilities redevelopment, with strong leadership, has seen the primary family congregation now approach its capacity within just 12 months of completion (attendance has increased further since the lodged average 2014 data). Similarly, Normanhurst reports new families and significant growth in its Youth Ministry.

22. It is naïve to think that facilities development of any kind is a ‘silver bullet’: certainly there are some other parishes that have experienced strong rates of growth; a number of parishes have been repotted with a key to success being effective leadership, and growth in some other parishes is the result of parish consolidation or the planting of new congregations. The picture cannot be reduced to any single factor. Clearly, leadership is a key factor. So too is facilities development and expansion, particularly in parishes approaching the capacity of their existing facilities.

23. Further factors should add some urgency to a further consideration of these matters –
   (a) We are currently in a low interest rate environment, meaning the cost of re-development is at historically low levels. These circumstances look like continuing in the near future.
   (b) Various local councils are explicitly preferring church expansion and redevelopment to occur outside of residential areas – where residential areas are the best place for churches to be!  
   (c) As we have noted, 70% of the growth of Sydney is projected to occur in brownfield areas.
   (d) While further church planting efforts are to be applauded and must continue, we ought also to invest in growing existing churches. The likes of Rooty Hill show the kind of impact that is possible.
   (e) Our Mission 2020 Value: ‘An urgent love for people who, apart from faith in Christ Jesus, face certain condemnation under the righteous judgment of God.’

Conclusion

24. The development and redevelopment of parish facilities has been an important factor in the growth of a number of parishes, particularly those with average attendance of over 200 adults. The parishes that have benefitted most demonstrably from property development are those that –
   (a) had a culture such that the level of newcomers is above the Diocesan average,
   (b) enjoyed strong leadership, and
   (c) in God’s kindness were able to develop their facilities while there was a growing need.

25. However, in the absence of other parish property assets that can be repositioned, the ability of medium and even larger parishes to fund such redevelopment is limited.

Possible Actions

26. A natural consequence of this conclusion is to develop a set of criteria to help assess and prioritise support for promising brownfield projects.

27. There is also the accompanying need to determine the means to support parishes in this area, and this should proceed with all ‘options on the table,’ including the consideration of –
   (a) Drawdown on the Diocesan Endowment to provide grants or loans. While some will suggest this, particularly in light of God’s kindness in the recovering Diocesan Endowment, such a proposal would require careful analysis and consideration in light of the need to protect the real value of the Endowment.
   (b) The introduction of a Brownfields levy (or reconfiguration of the existing Greenfields levy to include a brownfield component). Whilst acknowledging the unique challenges of acquiring

---

Footnote:

4 Parramatta Council, for example, now has a DCP limiting the auditorium size of public places of worship to 250 in residential areas. When you count children in the capacity, and apply the 80% rule (that a congregation is at capacity when it fills 80% of the available seats), this means a family congregation capacity of approximately 130 adults. Hornsby Council is limiting street frontage of public places of worship in residential areas to 50m. Bankstown Council received multiple submissions aimed at minimising the impact of public places of worship in residential areas.
greenfields land at the right time, it is still true that 70% of Sydney’s growth is forecast to be in brownfield areas. Funding growth through a levy, being a recurring method of fund raising, has the advantage of allowing a rolling program of the regeneration of parishes in brownfield areas.

(c) The establishment of a brownfields fundraising unit. Such a unit would ideally work in partnership with appropriate other Diocesan bodies to foster holistic parish development.

(d) The underwriting of loans by the Diocese.

(e) The utilisation of proceeds under the Large Receipts Policy, which in light of the establishment of the ‘New Churches for New Communities’ fundraising initiative (which provides for buildings in greenfield areas) and the Greenfields levy (which provides funds to acquire land in greenfield areas), may be an appropriate means of supporting brownfields ministry.

28. In considering the means to support brownfield building projects, opportunity should be provided for Synod members to contribute suggestions and feedback, which can be considered in this process.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

RAJ GUPTA
Member, Strategic Research Group
15 September 2015
Appendix A: Attendance and offertory Growth of Parishes receiving Brownfield Grants

**Offertory - inflation adjusted years from building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rooty Hill</th>
<th>Broadway</th>
<th>Dapto</th>
<th>Naremburn Cammeray</th>
<th>Glenmore Park</th>
<th>Berowra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B - 4</td>
<td>$342,322</td>
<td>$731,919</td>
<td>$413,843</td>
<td>$554,714</td>
<td>$346,513</td>
<td>$207,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - 3</td>
<td>$314,158</td>
<td>$677,201</td>
<td>$431,962</td>
<td>$634,540</td>
<td>$371,841</td>
<td>$211,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - 2</td>
<td>$351,862</td>
<td>$624,801</td>
<td>$395,076</td>
<td>$675,776</td>
<td>$382,467</td>
<td>$225,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - 1</td>
<td>$359,990</td>
<td>$601,483</td>
<td>$373,122</td>
<td>$684,579</td>
<td>$433,131</td>
<td>$214,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building year completion</td>
<td>$407,151</td>
<td>$592,877</td>
<td>$423,307</td>
<td>$699,807</td>
<td>$396,502</td>
<td>$220,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +1</td>
<td>$465,682</td>
<td>$672,388</td>
<td>$427,596</td>
<td>$712,904</td>
<td>$430,390</td>
<td>$235,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +2</td>
<td>$655,471</td>
<td>$408,201</td>
<td>$795,142</td>
<td>$452,665</td>
<td>$330,698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +3</td>
<td>$613,560</td>
<td></td>
<td>$994,354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$989,908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 year growth since build | 14% | 13% | 1% | 2% | 9% | 6%
2 year growth since build | 61% | -4% | 14% | 14% | 50%

**Adult Attendance - years from building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rooty Hill</th>
<th>Broadway</th>
<th>Dapto</th>
<th>Naremburn Cammeray</th>
<th>Glenmore Park</th>
<th>Berowra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B - 4</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - 3</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - 2</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - 1</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building year completion</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +1</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +2</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +3</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +4</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B +5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 year growth since build | 10% | 5% | 1% | 4% | 2% | 19%
2 year growth since build | 21% | 13% | -4% | 17% | 8% | 23%
3 year growth since build | 31% | -2% | 20% | 15% | 37% |

**Levels of NCLS 'Newcomers'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 NCLS (avg 11.4%)</th>
<th>2011 NCLS (avg 9.3%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 The NCLS Newcomers statistic measures the proportion of a congregation that were not at any church 5 years previously. Those captured by the measure in 2006, for example, would not be counted as Newcomers again in 2011, as they are now regarded as established in the congregation that they had joined. Further, the nature of statistic means that as a congregation grows in absolute numbers, it will require a larger number of absolute newcomers to preserve the percentage statistic. The 2016 NCLS survey will provide more accurate statistical data as to the 'post building' impact on Newcomers.
### Adult Attendance at 'primary congregation / service'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rooty Hill</th>
<th>Broadway (PM)</th>
<th>Dapto</th>
<th>Naremburn Cammeray</th>
<th>Glenmore Park</th>
<th>Berowra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>401*</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>386*</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10 yr growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rooty Hill</th>
<th>Broadway (PM)</th>
<th>Dapto</th>
<th>Naremburn Cammeray</th>
<th>Glenmore Park</th>
<th>Berowra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Numerical**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rooty Hill</th>
<th>Broadway (PM)</th>
<th>Dapto</th>
<th>Naremburn Cammeray</th>
<th>Glenmore Park</th>
<th>Berowra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaded cells indicate the completion of the building project

* Combination of now split congregations / services.
## Appendix B: Funding of Church Building Projects (greater than $1M) 2005-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Project Total ($)</th>
<th>Internal Fundraising ($)</th>
<th>Loan ($)</th>
<th>Diocesan Grant ($)</th>
<th>Property sale ($)</th>
<th>Other ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>New church building</td>
<td>Apr 2012</td>
<td>18,500K</td>
<td>3,900K</td>
<td>1,500K</td>
<td>1,750K</td>
<td>2,300K</td>
<td>9,050K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoxton Park</td>
<td>New ministry centre</td>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
<td>5,280K</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400K</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,880K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sydney</td>
<td>St. Thomas Ministry Centre</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
<td>4,400K</td>
<td>1,200K</td>
<td>3,200K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narembum / Cammeray</td>
<td>New church / administration facilities</td>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>3,900K</td>
<td>3,125K</td>
<td>250K</td>
<td>500K</td>
<td>25K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowral</td>
<td>New ministry centre</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>3,800K</td>
<td>1,800K</td>
<td>200K</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,800K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooty Hill</td>
<td>New ministry centre</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td>3,300K</td>
<td>900K</td>
<td>1,250K</td>
<td>1,150K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapto</td>
<td>New ministry centre</td>
<td>Aug 2011</td>
<td>3,300K</td>
<td>1,100K</td>
<td>1,100K</td>
<td>1,100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berowra</td>
<td>New ministry centre</td>
<td>Sep 2011</td>
<td>3,000K</td>
<td>1,500K</td>
<td>600K</td>
<td>900K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanhurst</td>
<td>New ministry centre</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
<td>2,700K</td>
<td>1,300K</td>
<td>1,400K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmore Park</td>
<td>New auditorium</td>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
<td>2,400K</td>
<td>300K</td>
<td>1,200K</td>
<td>900K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Bay</td>
<td>Hall alterations &amp; additions</td>
<td>Apr 2014</td>
<td>2,400K</td>
<td>800K</td>
<td>600K</td>
<td>1,000K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>Church alterations &amp; additions</td>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>2,400K</td>
<td>400K</td>
<td>1,000K</td>
<td>1,000K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Mountains</td>
<td>New ministry centre</td>
<td>Mar 2014</td>
<td>2,385K</td>
<td>235K</td>
<td>1,000K</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,150K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatswood</td>
<td>Hall alterations &amp; additions</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
<td>2,210K</td>
<td>1,050K</td>
<td>460K</td>
<td>700K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Why</td>
<td>New parish centre</td>
<td>Apr 2008</td>
<td>2,000K</td>
<td>1,200K</td>
<td>800K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiama</td>
<td>New hall / ministry Centre</td>
<td>Aug 2013</td>
<td>1,750K</td>
<td>1,050K</td>
<td>700K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsons Bay</td>
<td>Hall alterations &amp; additions</td>
<td>Mar 2014</td>
<td>1,675K</td>
<td>75K</td>
<td>1,600K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithfield Road</td>
<td>Church alterations &amp; additions</td>
<td>Aug 2013</td>
<td>1,600K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pymble</td>
<td>Church alterations &amp; additions</td>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
<td>1,500K</td>
<td>1,000K</td>
<td>500K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymea</td>
<td>Church alterations &amp; additions</td>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>1,200K</td>
<td>400K</td>
<td>800K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engadine</td>
<td>Church alterations</td>
<td>Feb 2006</td>
<td>1,150K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,150K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                | 70,850K                                | 21,135K         | 16,910K           | 8,700K                   | 10,950K  | 12,955K           |                   |           |
| Total without Broadway| 52,350K                                | 17,435K         | 15,410K           | 6,950K                   | 8,650K   | 3,905K            |                   |           |

Percentages: 33% 29% 13% 17%
Mission Property Committee

(A progress report from the Mission Property Committee.)

Key points

- A strategically located 1-hectare site in Marsden Park has been acquired by the Mission Property Committee in August 2015.
- The new Oran Park Ministry Centre was officially opened on 2 May 2015.

Strategic Land acquired in Marsden Park, NSW

1. Following an intensive land search, the Mission Property Committee ("MPC") acquired a strategically located site at 49-51 Vine Street West, in the growth suburb of Marsden Park in Sydney’s North West in August 2015.

2. The cost of $3 million was materially funded by all parishes across the Diocese through the Synod approved greenfields land acquisition levy ordinance (the “Ordinance”) that commenced in 2013 to promote the Diocesan Mission by enabling all parishes to support the establishment of church sites in new growth areas.

3. The 1-hectare site has sufficient land area on which to construct a new ministry centre with car parking areas and room for future expansion in the coming decades.

4. The NSW Government has designated Marsden Park as a major centre in the North West Priority Growth Area. NSW Department of Planning and Environment (’DoP’) forecasts indicate population growth within a 4km radius of the proposed ministry centre to be 50,000+ people by 2035.

5. Residential development has commenced at a number of land release areas in Marsden Park including the Stockland Elara development that will eventually be home to around 2,000 families.
6. MPC encourages Synod to support the continuance of the Ordinance so that further sites may be acquired in other growth areas of the Diocese.

Opening of Oran Park Ministry Centre

7. Archbishop Glenn Davies officially opened the Oran Park ministry centre on 2 May 2015. The iconic public building includes a 250-seat auditorium, associated breakout area and foyer space, children’s meeting rooms, kitchen and amenities as well as car parking. A feature is the 20m high coloured-glass tower can be seen from various viewpoints across the town.

Oran Park Ministry Centre

8. Oran Park was first identified as a location in which a new church was required by Archbishop Donald Robinson in 1989. The new ministry centre sits at a prominent site overlooking the town, on a street named for his predecessor Marcus Loane.

Stuart Starr standing next to Oran Park’s first church  The Archbishop preaches to a full house  
(Phillip Rodgers)  (Sharon’s Photography)

9. Completion of the ministry centre means that the newly formed parish is now well situated to continue to grow in numbers, under God, in line with the growing community, with NSW Government forecast showing ongoing annual population increases of 2,500 per year over the next seven years.

For and on behalf of the Mission Property Committee.

GEOFF KYNGDON  
Chair  
14 August 2015
Ordinances passed by the Standing Committee

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

Hunters Hill Trust Ordinance No 39, 2014
St James’ Sydney Phillip Street Property Ordinance 1962 Amendment Ordinance No 40, 2014
Randwick Trust Ordinance 2004 Amendment Ordinance No 41, 2014
Glebe Administration Ordinance 1930 Amendment Ordinance No 42, 2014
Broughton Village (Thompsons Road) Land Sale Ordinance No 43, 2014
Dundas/Telopea Land Sale Ordinance No 44, 2014
Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation Ordinance 1947 Amendment Ordinance No 45, 2014
Narrabeen Trust Ordinance No 46, 2014
Narrabeen Mortgaging Ordinance No 47, 2014
Endowment of the See (Pyrmont) Land Sale Ordinance No 48, 2014
Professional Standards Units (Funding) Ordinance No 49, 2014
Parish Administration (Safe Ministry) Amendment Ordinance No 1, 2015
Glenquarie Land Sale and Variation of Trusts Ordinance No 2, 2015
St Andrew’s House Trust Ordinance No 3, 2015
Synod Estimates Ordinance 1998 Amendment Ordinance No 4, 2015
Darlinghurst Trust Ordinance No 5, 2015
Pitt Town Trust Ordinance No 6, 2015
Professional Standards Unit (Funding) Ordinance No 7, 2015
Synod (General Synod Assessment) Special Application Ordinance No 8, 2015
Synod (Governance of Diocesan Organisations) Amendment Ordinance No 9, 2015
Neutral Bay (Pratten Trust) Variation of Trusts Ordinance No 10, 2015
Darling Street Trust Ordinance 2005 Amendment Ordinance No 11, 2015
Bulli Trust Ordinance No 12, 2015
Bulli Land Sale Ordinance No 13, 2015
Parish Administration (Registers) Amendment Ordinance No 14, 2015
Cost Recoveries Framework Ordinance 2008 Amendment Ordinance No 15, 2015
Dural District Trust Ordinance No 16, 2015
Glenhaven Trust Ordinance No 17, 2015
Glenhaven Mortgaging Ordinance No 18, 2015
Glenmore Park Trust Ordinance No 19, 2015
Mulgoa Land Sale Ordinance No 20, 2015
Rooty Hill Trust Ordinance No 21, 2015
Rooty Hill Mortgaging Ordinance No 22, 2015
Dapto Mortgaging Ordinance No 23, 2015
Moore Theological College (But-Har-Gra) Variation of Trusts Ordinance 2015 (assent withheld)
Glebe Trust Ordinance No 24, 2015
Campsie Trust Ordinance No 25, 2015
Lithgow Trust Ordinance No 26, 2015
Lithgow Boundary Adjustment Ordinance No 27, 2015
Miranda Trust Ordinance No 28, 2015
Miranda Land Sale Ordinance No 29, 2015

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ROBERT WICKS
*Diocesan Secretary*

29 September 2015
Parental leave for parish clergy

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

Key points
- An exposure draft bill has been prepared to make provision for parental leave for parish clergy.
- The Synod will be asked to give its in principle agreement to the proposal, having regard to some questions of policy that arise, before a final bill is brought to the 2016 session of the Synod.

Purpose
1. The purpose of this report is to introduce a proposal for parental leave for clergy for the consideration of the Synod as an exposure draft.

Recommendation
2. Synod receive this report.
3. Synod pass the following motion to be moved at Synod “by the request of the Standing Committee” –
   “Synod, noting the report Parental Leave for Parish Clergy –
   (a) agrees in principle to making provision for parental leave for parish clergy by ordinance, and
   (b) invites Synod members to send any comments on the exposure draft bill for the Parental Leave Ordinance 2015 to the Diocesan Secretary by 31 December 2015 and requests the Standing Committee to take these comments into account in finalising a bill for consideration at the 2016 session of Synod.”

Background
4. At its meeting on 25 May 2015, the Standing Committee appointed a committee comprising Archdeacon Kara Hartley, the Rev Natalie Ray, the Rev Andrew Graham and a person appointed by the Stipends and Allowances Committee (Mr Paul Willis) to bring a proposal for parental leave for clergy to a future meeting, in consultation with the Archbishop.

Evidence
5. The committee has prepared a bill for the Parental Leave Ordinance 2015 and an accompanying explanatory statement. These are attached as Attachments 2 and 3. The bill is modelled on one that was put before the 1998 session of Synod, but not reached in the business of the Synod that year. The Committee has consulted with the Archbishop and the bill has been amended to incorporate the Archbishop’s feedback.
6. The bill aims to achieve the following things –
   (a) Clarity for rectors, wardens and ministers as to the minimum, reasonable expectations regarding parental leave for clergy. The bill states that it sets out the minimum parental leave entitlements and allows more favourable entitlements to be provided by mutual agreement.
   (b) Provide care for clergy as children enter the family.
   (c) Support clergy in a similar manner to Stipendiary Lay Workers.
7. Many Australian dioceses have made provision for parental leave for clergy. See Attachment 1 for a table summarising the provisions that are in place in those Australian dioceses for which information is readily available.
8. The bill may give rise to some questions of policy that should be considered carefully by the Synod. It is for this reason that the bill has been put forward to the Synod as an exposure draft, with an opportunity for Synod members to provide comments by the end of the year. Some of these questions may include –
   (a) Whether any barriers are being created for engaging female clergy in parishes?
      Instead of limiting rectors and wardens in engagement of clergy (male or female) the intention is to provide a clear framework for rectors and wardens in their support and care of clergy.
   (b) Whether male clergy ought to be entitled to 52 weeks paternity leave if they are to be the primary carer?
      Should male clergy have similar provisions to female clergy in circumstances where their wife returns to the work force full-time after childbirth?
(c) Whether such an ordinance would endorse a policy for women returning to work after childbirth?

It is not intended that the bill endorse or prescribe standard practice for if, and/or when, a female member of clergy should return to work. That is a matter for individual families. Rather it simply seeks to provide reasonable care of male and female clergy if they find themselves in the position of welcoming a child into their family.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ARCHDEACON KARA HARTLEY

24 August 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Notice</th>
<th>Paternity Leave</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Diocese of Sydney</td>
<td>Up to 52 weeks.</td>
<td>None (except PCR “ministry costs” for the first 2 weeks).</td>
<td>Can remain in parish provided house, subject to payment of occupation fee that the Regional Bishop has approved as being “just and equitable” in the circumstances.</td>
<td>12 months continuous service in the parish</td>
<td>At least 3 months (unless this is not reasonably practicable).</td>
<td>Up to 2 weeks unpaid (except PCR “ministry costs” and housing).</td>
<td>The bill reflects minimum entitlements. More favorable entitlements can be offered by agreement. Ordinarily female clergy will be able to claim up to 18 weeks paid parental leave from Centrelink at the minimum wage and male clergy up to 2 weeks “Dad and Partner Pay”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Leave Bill 2015</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Diocese of Perth</td>
<td>52 weeks unpaid to be the primary care giver. Can apply to parish council for extension.</td>
<td>None. No allowances while on leave</td>
<td>Can remain in rectory, but must pay rent equivalent to clergy housing allowance. Must vacate if they resign during leave.</td>
<td>12 months continuous service</td>
<td>At least 10 weeks before date leave to be taken.</td>
<td>1 week unpaid concurrent with spouse. 52 weeks unpaid if primary carer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Council Clergy Leave Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Diocese of Adelaide</td>
<td>Up to 52 weeks. Further maternity leave can be taken by agreement. Cannot take concurrent leave with spouse (apart from 8 weeks paternity leave).</td>
<td>First 12 weeks are paid leave. Paid at “ordinary remuneration” less any amount entitled to under Commonwealth paid parental leave scheme.</td>
<td>Not addressed in ordinance.</td>
<td>12 months continuous service</td>
<td>At least 17 weeks’ notice required before date maternity leave to be taken. 4 weeks’ notice in the case of paternity leave. 8 weeks for adoption leave.</td>
<td>Up to 8 weeks (does not need to be continuous).</td>
<td>Period must be agreed between the member of clergy, wardens and archdeacon (but determined by bishop if no agreement). Maternity leave in excess of 3 months must be approved by bishop. Paternity leave in excess of 1 week must be approved by bishop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy Parenting Leave Ordinance 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anglican Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn</strong>&lt;br&gt;Clergy Leave Ordinance 1995</td>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
<td><strong>Paid</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Qualifications</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notice</strong></td>
<td><strong>Paternity Leave</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A maximum of 52 weeks leave. Diocese to pay super, family allowance, LSL and personal insurance during unpaid leave.</td>
<td>A period not exceeding 12 weeks paid maternity leave. Payment and provision of the same stipend, emoluments and benefits received immediately prior to leave. Includes allowances for housing, transport, telephone, energy and family.</td>
<td>During unpaid leave can live in parish provided accommodation but must pay rent at an agreed rate.</td>
<td>No period but must be a &quot;female clergy member who is married&quot;.</td>
<td>Commences one month before expected date of confinement unless otherwise agreed.</td>
<td>Paternity leave – paid leave for up to 5 days in total (to be taken within period 1 week before birth and 6 months after birth of child). Bishop can grant extended paid leave if clergy member will be &quot;the major carer of the child&quot;.</td>
<td>Return to position – entitled to return to position at end of leave if at least 3 weeks before the end of the period of paid maternity leave –&lt;br&gt;(a) clergy notifies parish of intention to return at end of paid leave, or&lt;br&gt;(b) has reached agreement with parish to return to position at the end of the unpaid leave period. If non-compliance with these requirements the bishop can revoke the licence after giving an opportunity to show cause. However some limitations on capacity to revoke if clergy claims that she was not able to reach agreement on reasonable terms and conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Anglican Diocese of Bathurst</strong>&lt;br&gt;Parental Leave Regulations | Up to 52 weeks. | 12 weeks of the leave is paid. The Diocese makes provision for payment of all stipend, emoluments and benefits (except housing) paid during paid leave, housing allowance for locum and super, LSL and stipend continuance insurance during unpaid leave. [It is not clear how this is funded]. | &quot;Clergy will be able to remain in their home during this leave&quot; | Qualifying period of 40 weeks continuous service. | Nothing stated. | Nothing stated. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Notice</th>
<th>Paternity Leave</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair Work Act 2009 (for comparison)</td>
<td>Up to 52 weeks. Can request up to an additional 52 weeks, which an employer can only refuse on 'reasonable business grounds'. Additional 2 days pre-adoption leave.</td>
<td>No statutory entitlement (apart from separate Commonwealth Paid Parental Leave Scheme – 18 weeks at national minimum wage, plus 2 weeks for dads).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12 months continuous service</td>
<td>At least 10 weeks, which details to be confirmed 4 weeks from EDC.</td>
<td>Same entitlement as mother if father will be the primary carer or the mother is not employed. Entitlement to 8 weeks of concurrent leave if mother on parental leave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parental Leave Ordinance 2015

No , 2015

Long Title
An Ordinance to provide for parental leave for members of the clergy in parishes in the Diocese of Sydney

The Synod of the Diocese of Sydney Ordains as follows.

Part 1 – Introduction

1. Name
This Ordinance is the Parental Leave Ordinance 2015.

2. Definitions
In this Ordinance –

**Adoption Leave** is leave taken by a male or female Minister in connection with the adoption by the Minister of a child under the age of 5 years not being a child who –
   (a) has previously lived continuously with the Minister for a period of at least 6 months, or
   (b) is a child or a step-child of the Minister or the Minister’s spouse.

**Archbishop** means –
   (a) the Archbishop, or
   (b) during the absence of the Archbishop – the Archbishop’s Commissary, or
   (c) if the See is vacant – the Administrator of the Diocese.

**Assistant Minister** means an assistant minister and a senior assistant minister under the Assistant Ministers Ordinance 1990.

**Wardens** means –
   (a) in the case of a Parish to which Schedule 1 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 applies - the wardens of the principal or only church of the Parish, and
   (b) in the case of a Parish to which Schedule 2 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 applies – the Wardens of the Parish as a whole, and
   (c) in the case of the Cathedral – St Andrew’s Cathedral Chapter.

**Maternity Leave** is leave taken by a married female Minister in connection with the pregnancy or the birth of a child of the Minister.

**Minister** means –
   (a) a Rector, or
   (b) an Assistant Minister.

**Paternity Leave** is leave taken by a male Minister in connection with the pregnancy or the birth of a child of the Minister’s spouse.

**Parental Leave** is –
   (a) Adoption Leave, or
   (b) Maternity Leave, or
   (c) Paternity Leave.

**Parish** means –
   (a) a parish or provisional parish constituted under or recognised as such for the purposes of the Parishes Ordinance 1979, and
   (b) a recognised church or a provisional recognised church under the Recognised Churches Ordinance 2000.

**Rector** includes the Dean of St Andrew’s Cathedral.

**Regional Bishop** means the bishop of the region within which the Minister is licensed.
Part 2 – Parental Leave for Women

3. **Entitlement to leave**
   (1) A female Minister is entitled to –
       (a) up to 52 weeks continuous Maternity Leave as provided by this Ordinance;
       (b) up to 52 weeks continuous Adoption Leave as provided by this Ordinance.
   (2) Maternity Leave is not to extend beyond 52 weeks after the date of birth of the child.
   (3) Adoption Leave is not to extend beyond 52 weeks after the date of placement of the child.

4. **Notice to be given**
   (1) Before taking Parental Leave to which she is entitled under clause 3, the Minister, subject to clause 4(3), must give at least 3 months written notice of –
       (a) the expected date of birth of the child or the expected date of placement of the child, and
       (b) the dates on which –
           (i) the Parental Leave is to begin, and
           (ii) the Parental Leave is to end.
   (2) Notice under clause 4(1) must be given to –
       (a) the Archdeacon for Women’s Ministry,
       (b) the Regional Bishop, and
       (c) the Rector of the Parish to which the Minister is licensed, and
       (d) the Wardens of the Parish to which the Minister is licensed.
   (3) If, by reason of circumstances, it is not reasonably practicable for a Minister to comply with clause 4(1) she must give notice as soon as possible to the persons referred to in clause 4(2) of the date on which the Parental Leave began or is to begin and the date on which the Parental Leave ended or is to end.

5. **Extending the end date of Parental Leave**
   (1) Parental Leave for which a Minister has given notice under clause 4 may be extended at the request of the Minister by her giving notice to the persons referred to in clause 4(2) not less than 4 weeks before the date specified for the purposes of clause 4(1)(b)(ii). The notice is to specify the new end date for the leave, which cannot be more than 52 weeks after the date specified for the purposes of clause 4(1)(b)(i).
   (2) A Minister is entitled to only one extension under clause 5(1). Any extension thereafter requires the agreement of the persons referred to in clause 4(2).

6. **Cancellation or shortening of Parental Leave**
   Parental Leave for which a Minister has given notice under clause 4 may be cancelled or shortened (whether or not the period of leave has commenced) at the request of the Minister and with the agreement of the persons referred to in clause 4(2).

7. **Remuneration**
   (1) The Minister is not entitled to be paid or receive benefits during the period of Parental Leave under this Part.
   (2) During the period of leave the Minister may remain in occupation of any accommodation usually provided to the Minister by the Parish if the Minister pays an occupation fee to the Wardens which the Regional Bishop has approved as being just and equitable having regard to all of the circumstances.
   (3) Notwithstanding provisions in the Cost Recoveries Framework Ordinance 2008 to the contrary, the Parish is not required to pay amounts under that Ordinance pertaining to the “ministry costs” of a Minister taking Parental Leave for the period beginning 2 weeks after the date the Parental Leave commences and ending on the date that the Parental Leave is to end, provided that the Wardens notify the Registrar in writing of –
       (a) the period of Parental Leave – as soon as practical after the Minister has given notice under clause 4, and
       (b) any change to the period of Parental Leave – as soon as practical after the leave has been extended, shortened or cancelled under clause 5 or 6.
8. **Entitlement**

A male Minister is entitled to –

(a) up to 2 weeks continuous Paternity Leave at any time up to 6 weeks after the birth of the child,

(b) up to 2 weeks continuous Adoption Leave at any time up to 6 weeks after the date of placement of the child.

9. **Notice to be given**

(1) Before taking Parental Leave to which he is entitled under clause 8, the Minister, subject to clause 9(3), must give at least 4 weeks written notice of –

(a) the expected date of birth of the child or the expected date of placement of the child, and

(b) the dates on which –

(i) the Parental Leave is to begin, and

(ii) the Parental Leave is to end.

(2) Notice under clause 9(1) must be given to –

(a) the Rector of the Parish to which the Minister is licensed, if the Minister is not the Rector, and

(b) the Wardens of the Parish to which the Minister is licensed.

(3) If, by reason of circumstances, it is not reasonably practicable for a Minister to comply with clause 9(1) he must give notice as soon as possible to the persons referred to in clause 9(2) of the date on which the Parental Leave began or is to begin and the date on which the Parental Leave ended or is to end.

10. **Remuneration**

The Minister is not entitled to be paid a stipend or any allowances during the period of Parental Leave, except that –

(a) the Minister may remain in occupation of any accommodation usually provided to the Minister by the Parish, and

(b) all payments required under the Cost Recoveries Framework Ordinance 2008 on account of the “ministry costs” of the Minister must continue to be paid.

**Part 4 – General provisions**

11. **Eligibility**

A Minister is only entitled to Parental Leave under this Ordinance if the Minister has had at least 12 months of continuous service in the Parish immediately prior to the time of taking such leave.

12. **Continuity of service**

(1) Parental Leave taken under this Ordinance does not break a Minister’s continuity of service.

(2) However, unless otherwise required by law or ordinance, Parental Leave in excess of 2 weeks is not to be taken into account in calculating a Minister’s period of service for any purpose.

13. **Parental Leave and other leave**

(1) A Minister may take any annual leave or long service leave (or any part of it) to which the Minister is entitled instead of or in conjunction with Parental Leave.

(2) However, the total period of leave taken by a female Minister cannot be extended beyond the maximum period of Parental Leave to which that Minister is entitled under this Ordinance.

14. **Minimum entitlements**

This Ordinance sets out the minimum entitlements of a Minister to Parental Leave. Entitlements which are more favourable to the Minister may be agreed among –

(a) the Minister, and

(b) if the Minister is a Rector, the Regional Bishop, and

(c) if the Minister is not a Rector, the Rector of the Parish to which the Minister is licensed, and

(d) the Wardens of the Parish to which the Minister is licensed.

15. **Return to service**

(1) A Minister who takes Parental Leave is entitled to return, at the end of the period of leave, to the office held immediately before the commencement of that leave.
(2) A female Minister who has taken Parental Leave may request that the Rector apply to the Archbishop for her to be licensed to an office in the Parish on a part-time basis. The request must be in writing, setting out the details of the proposed change of licence and the reasons for the change. This clause does not impose any obligation on the Rector or the Archbishop.

(3) If a Minister does not return to perform the duties of the office upon the end of the period of Parental Leave, including in circumstances where a request made under clause 15(2) has been declined, the Archbishop may revoke the licence of the Minister in respect of that office.

(4) Before revoking a licence under clause 15(3) the Archbishop must give the Minister opportunity to show cause why the licence should not be revoked.

I certify that the Ordinance as printed is in accordance with the Ordinance as reported.

Chair of Committees

I certify that this Ordinance was passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 2015.

Secretary of Synod

I assent to this Ordinance.

Archbishop of Sydney

/ /2015
Parental Leave Ordinance 2015

Explanatory Statement

Key point
- The bill for the Parental Leave Ordinance 2015 provides female clergy licensed to a parish up to 52 weeks continuous unpaid maternity or adoption leave and their male counterparts up to 2 weeks continuous unpaid paternity or adoption leave.

Purpose
1. The purpose of the bill is to provide for parental leave for members of the clergy licensed to parishes.

Recommendation
2. The Synod pass the bill as an ordinance of the Synod.

Explanation

Parental Leave for Women
3. Under the bill a female minister will be entitled to up to 52 weeks continuous maternity leave and up to 52 weeks continuous adoption leave. These entitlements are similar to those of female employees under the national employment standards in the Fair Work Act 2009, except that an employee can request an additional period of leave of up to 52 weeks, which can only be refused on ‘reasonable business grounds’.

4. Parental leave is to be unpaid, except that cost recoveries payments pertaining to ‘ministry costs’ will be paid for the first 2 weeks of leave, which is consistent with the paternity leave period for male ministers.

5. Subject to meeting the eligibility criteria, a female minister on parental leave will be entitled to 18 weeks pay at the national minimum wage under the Commonwealth Paid Parental Leave Scheme. These payments are subject to income tax. Presently the national minimum wage is $656.90 per week.

6. A female minister may remain in occupation of any accommodation usually provided by the parish during any period of parental leave if she pays an occupation fee to the wardens which the Regional Bishop has approved as being just and equitable having regard to all of the circumstances. What is just and equitable may vary depending on a variety of factors, for example: whether the accommodation is owned by the parish or leased, the market value of rent in the area, the housing needs of the other staff of the parish and any alternative housing options available to the minister.

7. The notice requirements are set out in clause 4 of the bill. They require 3 months notice before the commencement of the leave, but give flexibility if it is not reasonably practicable for the minister to comply with this requirement.

8. Parental leave may be extended once under clause 4 at the request of the minister by her giving notice. Any further extensions must be by agreement. The total period of leave cannot exceed 52 weeks.

9. Parental leave may be cancelled or shortened at the request of the minister on the terms set out in clause 6.

Parental Leave for Men
10. Under the bill a male minister will be entitled to –

   (a) up to 2 weeks continuous paternity leave up to the date being 6 weeks after the birth of the child,

   (b) up to 2 weeks continuous adoption leave at any time up to 6 weeks after the placement of the child.

11. The entitlements of male clergy to parental leave are more limited than for male employees under the Fair Work Act 2009 who are entitled to up to 8 weeks leave concurrently with their spouse if she is on leave or 52 weeks leave if they are the primary carer. One reason for limiting the entitlements of male clergy is because ministry in a parish could be seriously affected if the (male) rector was absent for an extended period.
12. While on parental leave a male minister is not to be paid a stipend or any allowances usually provided to the minister. The Minister may remain in occupation of any accommodation usually provided to the Minister by the Parish, and all payments required under the Cost Recoveries Framework Ordinance 2008 on account of the “ministry costs” of the Minister must continue to be paid. Subject to meeting the eligibility criteria, a male minister on unpaid parental leave will be entitled to 2 weeks ‘Dad and Partner Pay’ at the national minimum wage under the Commonwealth Paid Parental Leave Scheme.

13. The notice requirements are set out in clause 9.

**General Provisions**

14. A minister will only be entitled to parental leave if he or she has had at least 12 months of continuous service in the parish immediately prior to the time of taking the leave. Parental leave taken under the bill will not break a minister’s continuity of service but, to the extent the leave exceeds 2 weeks, it is not to be taken into account in determining a minister’s period of service.

15. It is important to note that the bill provides that the entitlements of a minister to parental leave are minimum entitlements. Entitlements that are more favourable to the minister may be agreed between the persons referred to in clause 14.

16. Under the bill a minister may take any annual leave or long service leave instead of, or in conjunction, with parental leave. However, in the case of a female minister, the total period of leave cannot be extended beyond the maximum period of 52 weeks. Though a more favourable arrangement could be agreed upon in accordance with clause 14.

17. A female minister who has taken parental leave may request that the rector apply to the Archbishop for her to be licensed to an office in the Parish on a part-time basis in accordance with the terms in clause 15(2). The clause does not impose any obligation on the rector or the Archbishop since local circumstances may make granting the request impractical.

18. The Archbishop may revoke the licence of a minister, after giving the minister opportunity to show cause, if the minister does not return to perform the duties of office at the end of the period of parental leave.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ROBERT WICKS
Diocesan Secretary

19 August 2015
Progress in responding to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse

(A report from the Diocesan Royal Commission Steering Committee.)

Purpose

1. To inform the Synod of progress in the response of this Diocese to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Sexual Abuse (Commission).

Background

2. The work of the Royal Commission may be summarised as follows –
   (a) the Commission is charged with examining the sexual abuse of children in the context of institutions throughout Australia including churches and their agencies;
   (b) unlawful or improper treatment of children that accompanied child sexual abuse may be considered by the Commission;
   (c) the Commission will identify where systems have failed to protect children and make recommendations on how to improve laws, policies and practices to prevent and better respond to child sexual abuse in institutions;
   (d) the Commission will not prosecute matters or make determinations for compensation;
   (e) the Commission will investigate allegations and refer criminal matters to the appropriate authorities for prosecution where appropriate;
   (f) the Commission will obtain information in a number of ways including by issuing notices to produce, conducting public and private hearings and releasing issues papers for public submissions;
   (g) the Commission will last 5 years (2013 to 2017).

3. The Royal Commission has served notices to produce on a number of Anglican Dioceses and organisations including our own.

4. The first public hearings of the Royal Commission commenced on 16 September 2013 and there have been 29 public hearings to date. A transcript of the public hearings is available on the Commission’s website: http://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au.

5. The first Anglican organisation the subject of a public hearing was the Diocese of Grafton concerning the North Coast Children’s Home. The hearing began on 18 November 2013 and concluded on 27 November 2013. The Commission published a Report on its findings and recommendations on 27 October 2014. The second Anglican organisation the subject of a public hearing concerns the Anglican Diocese of Tasmania and the Hutchins School. The hearing began on 19 November 2014 for 5 consecutive days, with a sixth and final day on 18 December 2014. The Report on the Commission’s findings and recommendations is yet to be published.

6. The Royal Commission released its Interim Report on 30 June 2014. In the Interim Report, the Royal Commission confirmed that –
   (a) it will require a further 2 years (until the end of 2017) to complete its work;
   (b) at this stage it is too early for the Royal Commission to make any recommendations;
   (c) only 70 public hearings will be able to be completed within the time it has allowed;
   (d) of the public hearings held to date themes include repeated abuse, multiple perpetrators, barriers to reporting abuse and adults that have systematically failed to protect children.

7. Justice Peter McClellan AM, Chairman of the Royal Commission, in his address to the 14th (Triennial) Assembly of the Uniting Church in Australia in Perth on 15 July 2015 confirmed that the Royal Commission had –
   ● received the stories of more than 1,527 people in private sessions;
   ● offered a private session to around 1,527 further people who have been accepted for a private session;
   ● referred over 666 matters to the authorities (including police).

8. The Commission has received more than 23,590 phone calls, more than 11,904 pieces of correspondence and continues to receive requests for private sessions at the rate of almost 50 per week.
The Anglican Church of Australia’s response to the Royal Commission

9. A Royal Commission Working Group (Working Group) was established by the General Synod Standing Committee (GSSC) on 13 November 2012 to co-ordinate the Anglican Church of Australia’s response to the Commission and to support and advise Dioceses and associated Anglican schools and agencies in any individual response they may be called on to make to the Commission.

10. The members of the Working Group are the Primate, the General Secretary of the General Synod Ms Anne Hywood, Mr Garth Blake SC, Ms Sue Harrington (lawyer SA), Mr Ken Spackman (Registrar Melbourne Diocese), the Rev Dr Andrew Ford (Anglicare, Sydney).

11. In late 2012 the Working Group co-ordinated a submission to the Federal Government on behalf of the Anglican Church of Australia concerning the Terms of Reference for the Commission.

12. The Working Group has recommended a two-staged approach to responding and preparing for the Royal Commission involving –

(a) Undertaking, as an initial priority, a comprehensive and urgent review of all past cases of child sexual abuse within the Anglican Church of Australia.

(b) As a second priority, reviewing the policies and procedures of dioceses and their associated Anglican schools and agencies for the prevention of and response to child sexual abuse.

13. The reviewing of past cases was thought to serve at least two purposes –

(a) To ensure dioceses and associated agencies are prepared for the Commission in case they are the subject of any investigation by the Commission or are required to give evidence before the Commission.

(b) To enable a complete picture to be prepared of the Anglican Church of Australia’s responses to child sexual abuse in the past.

14. The Working Group has been active in co-ordinating submissions to the Royal Commission on behalf of the Anglican Church of Australia in response to Issues Papers. The Steering Committee intends to contribute to these submissions from time to time.

The Steering Committee

15. The Standing Committee appointed a Steering Committee in December 2012 to oversee the response of the Diocese to the Royal Commission and to provide the Director of Professional Standards with a point of reference for undertaking this work. The membership of the Steering Committee was revised by Standing Committee on 16 February 2015 and the current members are Ms Michelle England, the Rev Dr Andrew Ford, Mr Doug Marr, Mr Michael Meek SC (Chair), Mr Russell Powell and Dr Robert Tong AM. Mr Lachlan Bryant and Mr Steve Lucas provide support to the Committee.

16. In March 2013, the Standing Committee passed the Synod (Royal Commission) Special Application Ordinance 2013 to allocate funds for the costs and expenses of preparing for and responding to the Commission. These funds are applied at the direction of the Steering Committee, which reports to Standing Committee on a quarterly basis. The Property Trust has also contributed an equal amount of the funds.

17. The expenditure incurred by the Steering Committee to date is tracking well within budget.

18. On average the Steering Committee meets about once every 2 months or as needed.

Review of past cases of the Diocese held by the Professional Standards Unit (PSU)

19. After receiving the Working Group’s advice concerning the file review a comprehensive review of all past cases concerning child sexual abuse was planned using the Case File Review form issued by the Working Group as the point of reference.

20. Sparke Helmore was chosen to complete the file review and scanning of files for a fixed price. The work was overseen by Mrs Gillian Davidson, a partner at Sparke Helmore and a member of the Standing Committee.

21. The file review was completed in June 2013. Extensive work has continued throughout 2014 and 2015 as a result of the review. The key areas of work are –

- A general review of file management practices, including for example –
  - Marrying up related files;
  - Implementing clear file management practices in order to more easily differentiate and isolate ‘current’ files, that is, files where further work is required, from ‘inactive’ files, that is, files where no further action is necessary at this time;
• A further extensive review of files that require particular attention for a number of reasons such as length or notoriety, including a detailed analysis and compilation of chronologies;
• Systematically attending to any outstanding matters such as making reports to police in cases where it is unclear whether this was done or making reasonable inquiries to follow up information received where this does not appear to have been done;
• Referring files held on behalf of other dioceses and organisations to the Diocese or organisation concerned for their records, further review if necessary, and further action if warranted;
• Making inquiries to locate further files that may be relevant to the Royal Commission including from the Diocesan archives;
• Assessing matters as to whether they should be entered onto the National Register. As the National Register system upgrade is now complete, the names of further persons are able to be entered on the National Register upon the completion of further file review work as required.

22. This work has put considerable pressure on the staff and resources of the PSU and the Diocesan Contact Persons. At this stage the work is progressing slowly but well. We estimate that since June 2013 this in-depth file review work has been undertaken across more than 75% of relevant files. In most cases there has been significant progress towards finalisation of work required in those files and in some cases this work is now complete.

23. A key recommendation flowing from the file review was for a comprehensive child protection policy review to be undertaken. Professor Patrick Parkinson was engaged to undertake a review of child protection policies generally and this was completed in late March 2014. The re-write and revision of policies is now being overseen by the Manager, Legal Support for the PSU under the supervision of the Director.

Anglican schools and organisations in the Diocese

24. From late 2012 the Steering Committee worked with both the Archbishop’s office and the Director of Professional Standards to inform all relevant Anglican schools and organisations in the Diocese about the processes of the Royal Commission and to recommend schools and organisations undertake their own review of files and child protection policies and procedures. The Steering Committee has provided a Review Summary Questionnaire form to schools and organisations to obtain a high level summary of the review findings. Responses were received from a substantial majority of schools and organisations, which were generally helpful. This information will assist the Steering Committee in responding to requests from the Royal Commission. The Steering Committee has also offered assistance from the Archbishop’s Media Officer, Mr Russell Powell, in relation to media enquiries.

Royal Commission Report of Case Study 3 – Anglican Diocese of Grafton’s response to child sexual abuse at the North Coast Children’s Home

25. On 27 October 2014 the Commission handed down its Report concerning the public hearing into the Grafton Diocese’s handling of complaints arising from the North Coast Children’s Home (“Home”) from 2005 onwards. The Report is available on the following link –


26. The Commission’s public hearing into the matter heard evidence of frequent sexual, psychological and physical abuse perpetrated against nine former child residents at the Home between 1940 and 1985 and the profound, long lasting impacts on their lives and mental health. The conduct of claims for redress from these survivors together with other former residents of the Home, totalling 41 claimants, was also considered.

27. At its meeting on 10 November 2014 the Steering Committee considered matters arising from the Report. The Committee –

(a) Noting the Royal Commission’s findings concerning the acceptance of responsibility for affiliated institutions that are not formally Anglican, was of the view that the question of responsibility ought to be considered on a case by case basis rather than through a pre-determined set of criteria.

(b) Recommended that the Director of Professional Standards to write to the General Synod Professional Standards Commission to request it to examine the issues raised by the Royal Commission in respect to the need for a clear system to determine which diocese has responsibility for disciplining a member of clergy, noting that this may include protocols for information and cost sharing between dioceses.
Noting the external file review by Sparke Helmore in 2013, and subsequent internal file review work and policy review work that is currently underway in preparation for the Royal Commission, and the review of the Discipline Ordinance 2006 to be conducted before Synod 2015, the Committee was of the view that the professional standards processes of the Diocese are under sufficient scrutiny at present.

Royal Commission consultation process and public hearing on Redress Schemes and Civil Litigation

28. Commencing in September 2014 the Commission convened a number of Private Roundtable discussions with representatives from peak government and non-government institutions and organisations, lawyers and insurers, to discuss the issues involved in redress to victims of child sexual abuse.

29. Participation in the roundtable discussions was by invitation from the Commission only. Dr Andrew Ford was involved in these roundtables as a representative of Anglicare Australia and Mr Martin Drevikovsky (then General Secretary of the General Synod) was involved as a representative from the Anglican Church of Australia.

30. On 30 January 2015 the Royal Commission released a Consultation Paper on Redress Schemes and Civil Litigation. The General Synod Working Group advised that a submission would be prepared in response to the Consultation Paper after a consultation process with the Dioceses of the Anglican Church of Australia.

31. The Steering Committee completed a considerable amount of work in the preparation of the response to the Consultation Paper. We particularly acknowledge the significant contribution of Michelle England in this regard. The views of the Steering Committee were clearly represented at each stage of this consultation process, enabling it to make a notable contribution to the submission.

32. The Working Group established a consultation process for the Anglican Church nationally by initially inviting representatives from the 23 Dioceses to attend an Anglican Redress conference in Sydney on 13 February 2015. Lachlan Bryant was the representative for Sydney at the conference on behalf of the Steering Committee and Dr Andrew Ford participated as a newly appointed member of the Working Group. Lachlan Bryant formed part of the smaller drafting group that met following the conference on 29 February 2015 to assist with drafting the submission. Archbishop Glenn Davies also successfully moved a number of changes to the final draft of the submission in support of the Steering Committee’s views when it was considered at the Bishop’s Conference on 6 March 2015.

33. While not all of the comments and suggested changes from the Steering Committee were included in the final Working Group submission lodged on 9 March 2015, the general thrust of the submission accorded with the views of the Steering Committee. The submission, titled “Anglican Church,” may be downloaded on the following link –


34. A public hearing on Redress was held from 25 to 27 March 2015 in Sydney. Mr Garth Blake SC and Ms Anne Hywood were invited to address the Commission on the second day of the public hearing as Working Group representatives to speak to the Working Group submission.

35. The Royal Commission’s final report on redress including recommendations is due to be published in mid 2015.

Diocese of Sydney and the Royal Commission

36. On 28 November 2014 the Diocese was served with a Notice to Produce for all documents and records involving allegations against an employee at a Sydney school and any response by the Diocese to such allegations. Sparke Helmore was engaged to assist in liaising with the Commission. We were subsequently advised that the School would be the focus of a public hearing in Sydney commencing 23 February 2015. In early January 2015 we were notified that the public hearing would not be proceeding and that Knox Grammar would be the subject of the public hearing commencing 23 February 2015 instead.

37. On 16 July 2015 the Diocese was served with a Notice to Produce for all documents and records involving allegations against a former clergyman who has been deposed of Holy Orders in another Diocese in the Province. Sparke Helmore has been engaged to assist in liaising with the Commission.

38. On 15 July 2015 we were informed by Anne Hywood, General Secretary of General Synod that the Royal Commission will soon be serving a Notice to Produce on the General Synod office for access to and information about the National Register of the Anglican Church.
39. We have also been advised that an Anglican Diocese, an (unnamed) Anglican School and the Church of England Boys Society will be the subject of scrutiny during the course of the Commission’s public hearings at some stage.

40. The Diocese has not been given notice of any direct involvement in a public hearing at this stage.

For and on behalf of the Royal Commission Steering Committee.

LACHLAN BRYANT  
Director, Professional Standards  
21 July 2015
47/14 Report of the Viability and Structures Task Force

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

Key points
- At the Synod’s request, the Standing Committee has responded to the Report of the Viability and Structures Task Force (being a report initially considered by the General Synod in 2014).
- The response asserts the critical importance of realising that the viability of churches and church structures is not principally about finances and resources but gospel integrity.
- The response also highlights the importance of ministry training and formation, opportunities for action at a provincial level, gaps in the analysis of the Viability Report and suggestions for less formal means of supporting ministry in other dioceses.

Purpose
1. To inform the Synod about the response of the Standing Committee to the Report of the Viability and Structures Task Force considered at the 2014 session of the General Synod.

Recommendation
2. Synod receive this report.

Background
3. Synod passed resolution 47/14 in the following terms –
   "Synod, noting –
   (i) the Report of the Viability and Structures Task Force (the “Viability Report”) considered at this year’s session of General Synod, and
   (ii) the response of the General Synod to the Viability Report in resolution 65/14 (the “Viability resolution”), particularly the referral of the Viability Report to the dioceses for their consideration and response to the Standing Committee of the General Synod by 31 October 2014,

(a) expresses its preliminary view that changing the structures, policies and leadership of the Anglican Church of Australia (the “ACA”) will not, of itself, adequately address the underlying challenges faced by the ACA, although agrees that the focus of work in these areas may best be pursued on a provincial basis,
(b) calls on the Standing Committee of the General Synod to ensure that clarity and confidence in the content of the gospel message and its faithful proclamation in word and deed across the ACA, particularly in the context of local Anglican churches, are at the fore of any proposal to respond to these challenges,
(c) affirms its commitment to the diocese as the unit of organisation of the ACA and therefore calls on the Standing Committee of the General Synod to ensure that it consults widely with dioceses about the Viability Report and the Viability Resolution over a reasonable time frame before formulating any significant proposals which may require the support of dioceses,
(d) opposes as a matter of principle any proposal which would involve an increase in the central powers of the General Synod as a means by which the challenges faced by the ACA are sought to be addressed,
(e) considers that the expectation of a considered response from dioceses to the Viability Report by 31 October 2014 is unrealistic,

and invites Synod members to send any comments on the Viability Report and Viability resolution to the Diocesan Secretary by 31 December 2014 and requests our Standing Committee to respond to the Viability Report and the Viability Resolution taking any comments from Synod members into account."

4. A copy of the Viability Report can be found at –
5. In accordance with the Synod’s request, the Standing Committee submitted a response to the Viability Report to the Standing Committee of the General Synod for consideration at its meeting in May 2015.

6. The response is reproduced in the Schedule.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ROBERT WICKS
Diocesan Secretary
1 May 2015
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1. Introduction

The Report of the General Synod Viability and Structures Task Force (the ‘Viability Report’) was referred by the General Synod to dioceses for response and accordingly it was considered by the October 2014 session of the Sydney Synod which resolved –

Synod, noting –

(i) the Report of the Viability and Structures Task Force (the ‘Viability Report’) considered at this year’s session of General Synod, and

(ii) the response of the General Synod to the Viability Report in resolution 65/14 (the ‘Viability resolution’), particularly the referral of the Viability Report to the dioceses for their consideration and response to the Standing Committee of the General Synod by 31 October 2014,

(a) expresses its preliminary view that changing the structures, policies and leadership of the Anglican Church of Australia (the ‘ACA’) will not, of itself, adequately address the underlying challenges faced by the ACA, although agrees that the focus of work in these areas may best be pursued on a provincial basis,

(b) calls on the Standing Committee of the General Synod to ensure that clarity and confidence in the content of the gospel message and its faithful proclamation in word and deed across the ACA, particularly in the context of local Anglican churches, are at the fore of any proposal to respond to these challenges,

(c) affirms its commitment to the diocese as the unit of organisation of the ACA and therefore calls on the Standing Committee of the General Synod to ensure that it consults widely with dioceses about the Viability Report and the Viability Resolution over a reasonable time frame before formulating any significant proposals which may require the support of dioceses,

(d) opposes as a matter of principle any proposal which would involve an increase in the central powers of the General Synod as a means by which the challenges faced by the ACA are sought to be addressed,

(e) considers that the expectation of a considered response from dioceses to the Viability Report by 31 October 2014 is unrealistic, and invites Synod members to send any comments on the Viability Report and Viability resolution to the Diocesan Secretary by 31 December 2014 and requests our Standing Committee to respond to the Viability Report and the Viability Resolution taking any comments from Synod members into account.

Immediately following the formal debate on the motion, Synod members were invited to make short comments to assist the Standing Committee frame a response. These comments together with further comments received in response to the final paragraph of the Resolution after the Synod session were taken into account in preparing this response.

The Viability Report is the first national snapshot of the Anglican Church of Australia (“ACA”) since its inauguration in 1961. While there are one or two bright spots, the overall picture is one of decline and retreat. The remedy offered is: revitalise the leadership, improve governance and redeploy resources. Although much valuable information is gathered in the report, there is a significant lack of integrated theological explanation as to why the ACA is in its present state and what corrective action, under God, should be taken.\(^2\) The other serious lack is a failure to properly examine and assess the different theological perspectives which have historically shaped the ACA.\(^3\)

This response enlarges on themes introduced in the Sydney Synod response resolution.

2. Matters of theology

The Sydney resolution (b) calls on the Standing Committee of the General Synod to ensure that clarity and confidence in the content of the gospel message and its faithful proclamation in word and deed across the ACA, particularly in the context of local Anglican churches, are at the fore of any proposal to respond to these challenges.

God’s redeeming and gathering work is attested throughout the Scriptures. The New Testament makes clear that the Church, the gathered people of God, is the centrepiece of God’s purposes. All history is heading towards that day when Christ’s redeemed people from every nation, tribe and language will be gathered around the throne of God and the Lamb (Rev. 7). In the interim between the resurrection of Christ and his return, this great gathering is anticipated in the churches where those who have responded to the gospel of Christ in repentance and faith are drawn together by the Spirit of God around the word of God. The gospel is the instrument God uses to form the Church and in turn the Church becomes ‘the pillar and foundation of the truth’ (1 Tim. 3:15).

For this reason a report about the viability of churches and church structures ought to give priority to clarity and confidence in the gospel of Jesus Christ and recognise that the structures serve first and foremost to support the churches who proclaim and live in obedience to that gospel. Diocesan and national structures have been developed over time as mechanisms for guarding and resourcing the churches where the gospel is proclaimed in accordance with the teaching of Scripture. They do not exist for their own sake but for the sake of the churches by which they are constituted. This means that the primary question when it comes to the viability of a diocese must be cast in terms of its capacity to encourage and resource clear gospel proclamation and gospel growth both in terms of evangelism and ongoing edification within the context of the local congregation.

It is critically important to realise that viability is not principally about finances and resources but gospel integrity. Sadly, this realisation is largely absent in the Viability Report, although it is worth noting that the discussion groups at the 16th General Synod kept returning to this point. There are very significant differences between dioceses on the most important theological questions and these are far from irrelevant when it comes to the question of how we might survive, let alone thrive, together. Without a much more extensive exploration of our core message, the rest is merely window dressing.

We might consider the letters of Christ to the seven churches in Asia Minor, recorded for us in the first three chapters of the book of Revelation as ‘viability reports’ on those churches. Rather than addressing their constitutions and structures, the risen Christ draws attention to their tolerance of false teaching and immoral behaviour. It becomes clear that it is possible for a church to amass the resources to ‘stay open’ long after they have ceased to be a viable church. The church in Laodicea is a case in point. Their wealth blinded them to their spiritual poverty. Other churches that were struggling to survive, who were only too aware of

\(^2\) A short theological reflection is appended to the Report at p 8-095 but this appears to be an afterthought.

\(^3\) See the May 2014 Report of the National Church Unity Task Force to General Synod which substantially enlarges the inadequate report printed at p. 8-085 of the Report.
their poverty in terms of resources, were praised as rich. Would a careful study of what makes a church viable in the sight of Christ be a better starting point than that chosen in the Viability Report?

Of course the issues of financial and organisational viability are important. The concrete needs of the churches need to be considered carefully. However, the fellowship enjoyed between churches who share a clear and confident focus on the gospel of Christ is a foundation for the sharing of resources. So even at the level of financial and organisational viability the bedrock issues are theological. Until serious attention is given to the divergent doctrines of church and the gospel, which exist within our national body, we cannot expect effective collaborative effort to evangelise Australia and build the congregations of God’s people.

We in the Diocese of Sydney value our links with Anglicans across Australia. We remain committed to the Anglican Church of Australia with its rich heritage stemming from the mission activity of the Church of England in the late eighteenth century. We long for that unity which arises from a common message and a common determination to live under the authority of the Scriptures as the word of God. We are committed to strengthening the clear and principled proclamation of Christ crucified, risen and reigning, of salvation from sin and judgment and the hope of a new heaven and new earth where righteousness dwells. To that end we take very seriously the theological education of those called to the ordained ministry in our churches.

3. Ministerial training and formation

One of the six key findings of the task force is the need for a comprehensive training programme for Ordained Local Ministry4 (see 8-048). The Report notes that many rural dioceses ‘have adopted various schemes of locally ordained ministry as a strategy to meet declining populations, remote locations and the inability to pay a stipend’. The Report encourages the further growth of this form of ministry and recommends the implementation of training standards for non-stipendiary clergy.

Sydney Diocese does not view the increased use of locally ordained ministers as a solution to the issues of viability and vitality of our church; in some cases this strategy may actually serve to exacerbate the problem. The ordained ministry is central to Anglican polity. Therefore, the viability of churches cannot be ultimately separated from the question of the recruitment, training and deployment of clergy. High priority must be given to ministerial training and formation. In the current circumstances we need men and women who have been well prepared for the challenges, joys and disappointments of contemporary gospel ministry. Without any suggestion that the Diocese of Sydney has all the answers, perhaps it will prove helpful to reflect on why we view this issue to be of such importance, and how this has shaped our approach to the requirements for ordination.

The standard requirement for ordination training and formation in the Diocese of Sydney is a 4 year BD at Moore College, which contains a substantial component of original language biblical study, followed by 3 years of formation in a parish as an assistant minister before ordination as a presbyter. Readiness for ordination is assessed by observation, interviews and reports from referees. During the three years as an assistant, a program of ministry development is undertaken.

There are two theological reasons why the Diocese requires ordination candidates to complete a 4 year fulltime residential degree. First, to be so immersed in the Word of God so that the student will be equipped to sustain a life-long pulpit ministry to ‘feed those committed to his charge’. By laying aside other preoccupations (rather than simply fitting study around those preoccupations) both breadth and depth in study are possible. In particular, such a single-minded attention to study allows the acquisition of a facility with the original biblical languages which is essential to this training.

Second, learning in community provides the relational context which reflects the relational nature of the gospel and God’s own triune character. The God who is fellowship in himself gathers his people to love, serve and edify one another. Training for Christian ministry is more than simply the exchange of ideas or developing the capacity to convey information accurately. It involves developing the appropriate convictions and patterns of behaviour (godly character) which commend the biblical gospel and assist the long-term consistency of life, message and ministry practice. This is best achieved through the ‘iron sharpening iron’ activity of a Christian community of fellow learners. Living out what is being learnt in prayer, conversation, and the practicalities of life and mutual service makes a critical difference in the ministry outcomes of a theological college.

Moore Theological College is the only Anglican theological college which requires full-time residence for degree students. The Diocese of Sydney remains committed to this model of ministerial training and formation because it regards the pastor/teacher as central to viable parishes and viable parishes make viable dioceses. Such pastor/teachers need deep learning but also strong convictions and consistent Christian character. It should be noted that in accordance with its objects, the ministerial training and

4 p. 8-048
formation offered by Moore Theological College is available to those preparing for Christian and, in particular, ordained Anglican ministry outside Sydney.\(^5\)

4. Structural Issues

The Sydney resolution (a) expressed a preliminary view that changing the structures, policies and leadership of the ACA will not, of itself, adequately address the underlying challenges faced by the ACA. While the Report gives some space to the views of Bob Jackson on the vision setting role of the diocese the gloss from Bishop Robert Forsyth is more apposite to the Australian situation.\(^6\) Likewise, pointing to the rearrangement of some English dioceses,\(^7\) being a beneficial exercise of central power, raises a completely unrealistic notion for constitutional structural change.

A key finding of the Report is that the role of the General Synod office and the General Secretary needs to be ‘enhanced’, and a proposal for this is contained in Appendix 6\(^8\). This expansion of the National office is based on the premise that ‘Strategy, Reform and Restructure’ can and should be driven from the ‘top-down’.

The Sydney resolution (d) opposed, as a matter of principle, increasing the powers of General Synod as a means by which the challenges faced by the ACA are sought to be addressed. These views should not be regarded as an expression of Sydney contrarianism. They arise from a belief that a focus on changing the structure, policies and leadership of the ACA are secondary issues that must not be used to avoid asking and responding to the more fundamental questions, outlined in part 2 of this report, about the ACA’s lack of viability.

On the other hand, the Sydney resolution (a) does recognise that, although secondary, any work in the areas of structure, policies and leadership may best be pursued on a provincial basis. We agree with the statement in the Report, ‘The bishops were largely of the opinion that provincial co-operation was a more achievable goal than trying to work as a National Church.’\(^9\) In the Province of New South Wales there is an established and well used legal framework for provincial initiative. Chiefly for the benefit of readers outside the province, the next few paragraphs set out this framework.

Although the constitutional/legal arrangements for the ACA vary from State to State, the historical development of the constitutional framework for the ACA places the diocese at the centre. At the beginning, in each Colony, the Church of England was an unincorporated association.

Apart from Tasmania, dioceses are grouped in provinces which largely follow state boundaries. There exists in NSW three Acts which provide the constitutional/legal framework for the seven Anglican Dioceses in the state (Sydney, Newcastle, Canberra & Goulburn, Bathurst, Grafton, Armidale and Riverina) –

1. The chief Act is the *Anglican Church of Australia Constitutions Act* 1902. This Act, in a Schedule, provides a constitution for each diocese. Decisions concerning property are made binding on the members of the church.

2. The *Anglican Church of Australia Trust Property Act* 1917 (1917 Act) gives wide powers of management of church property to a NSW diocesan synod. The synod (and in Sydney, the Standing Committee by delegation) has power under the 1917 Act to authorise the sale,

---

\(^5\) Ministerial training and formation has traditionally been an interest of diocesan bishops. Only in the last fifty years and only in a few universities has it been possible to study divinity or theology as a separate discipline. Previously, theological study for ordination had to be undertaken separately from the universities. To meet this need, some bishops established their own college for training ordinands. So in NSW, Broughton established St James’s College (1845-49), Barker (Moore 1856), and A.V. Green, St John’s in Armidale in 1898, relocated to Newcastle in 1918. The creation of the Australian College of Theology by the General Synod in 1891 as an examining body established the two-year Licentiate in Theology of the College as a minimum standard for ordination. H M Carey (*God’s Empire, Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c 1801-1908*, Cambridge 2011, pp247-287) has an illuminating survey on the training and supply of clergy in the nineteenth century.

Since the early 1970s, the level of theological education required for ordination has risen, so that a bachelor’s degree is now the accepted standard. A consequence is that smaller colleges have closed or joined ecumenical theological colleges. Larger colleges have been granted degree-awarding status. In some dioceses, arrangements have been made with local universities to supply the academic instruction, with ministerial formation remaining with the diocese.

With the demise of St John’s College, Morpeth and St Michael’s House, Crafers, South Australia, there is no college in the Anglo-Catholic tradition in Australia. Trinity College, Melbourne (1872) is the leading liberal Catholic college while St Mark’s, Canberra, meets needs across the theological spectrum. Moore Theological College, Sydney (1856), Ridley College, Melbourne (1910) and Trinity Theological College, Perth (1997) are evangelical in foundation and purpose.

\(^6\) pp. 8-010 – 8-013

\(^7\) p. 8-023

\(^8\) pp. 8-069 – 8-071

\(^9\) p. 8-049
mortgaging and leasing of church property. The Act also gives power to the synod to vary the trusts on which church property is held.

3. The Anglican Church of Australia (Bodies Corporate) Act 1938 allows a NSW Anglican synod to create a body corporate by resolution and a notice in the Government Gazette. In essence, this is a power to create a corporation without the need to satisfy the normal company creation requirements of the company law. Schools and other organisations can have their separate corporate existence. This is an aid to proper governance and also limits liability.

On the adoption of the present national 1961 constitution, the ACA was inaugurated and the legal nexus with the Church of England severed. The General Synod constitutional arrangements give each diocese the right to determine which church rules would apply to that diocese. Any canon of General Synod which touches on ritual ceremonial or discipline, the order and good government of the church within a diocese or the church trust property of a diocese does not become part of the law of a diocese until adopted by ordinance of that diocese. Clearly, at least for NSW if not the rest of Australia, the diocese remains the focal point for legislative initiatives.

Although provincial legislation in NSW does not have paramount effect, the existence of common secular laws governing voluntary associations, the existence of special legislation for the seven ACA dioceses in NSW, and the unifying office of Metropolitan strongly suggest that provincial constitutional arrangements offer a genuine and more manageable structural avenue for corrective initiatives to be explored at least in NSW if not in other provinces. Given this history and the locus of legislative power, any structural changes to address viability issues must start with dioceses and then co-operatively in the province.

There is presently a limited amount of co-operative action among dioceses of the Province of NSW and clearly scope for such action to be enhanced. However, even at the provincial level, there are likely to be limits on the extent of co-operative action unless the very significant theological differences that exist between dioceses can be resolved at a fundamental level.

It is for this reason that Sydney Diocese does not agree with the finding and recommendations of the Report that suggest that the strategy, reform and restructure of the ACA ought to, or can, be managed by an expanded General Synod Office.

5. Analysis Gaps

It is inevitable that a report which seeks to cover so much territory as is comprised in the 23 dioceses of the ACA and to do so with minimal resources would contain gaps. As noted in the introduction, the overarching gap is an absence of an integrated theological explanation for the present state of the ACA. Connected with this is the absence of any real consideration of the historical and theological differences found in the ACA, as evidenced by the state of impaired communion consequent to the ordination of women priests and bishops.

Firstly, within the Report there is the failure of the Task Force to affirm or deny propositions advanced in the Report. An example is the following statement –

However the data for the metropolitan dioceses is frightening. How can a single diocese serve 5 million people plus? How can any diocesan bishop adequately relate to more than say 50 parish units?

The statement raises a several questions which are not addressed: First, on what data is the statement based? Why are 50 parishes the suggested limit of effective episcopal oversight and what happens if a diocese increases beyond 50 parishes? Second, is the statement based on a particular theological view of the nature of the episcopate? If so, what is that view? Finally, does the Task Force endorse this statement? Silence suggests that the members do. The experience and example of Sydney does not support the statement.

Of greater significance is the statement of Colin Reilly –

In only three dioceses (Armidale, North West Australia and Sydney) are sufficient numbers of clergy being ordained to replace those in current active ministry.

If correct, this situation, with the population of Australia on the increase, is alarming. Does the Task Force accept Reilly’s analysis? If the analysis was correct, surely it deserved further examination. The dioceses

10 The theological reflection in appendix 1 does not serve this purpose.
11 The Hon Robert Fordham p. 8-006.
12 p. 8-015. The full report by Colin Reilly Australian Anglican clergy 1995 & 2010 can be found at http://www.academia.edu/8251374/Australian_Anglican_clergy_1995_and_2010
of Armidale, North West Australia and Sydney are very different geographical areas. How are these 3 dioceses able to secure the clergy they need? Why are the other 20 dioceses not able to do this? These obvious issues are ignored.

A second gap is the failure of the Report to look outside the ACA to churches in non-metropolitan cities that, in the last 25 years, have sprung up and grown significantly. The most remarkable growth has been the establishment of independent evangelical churches in the eastern States of Australia. The first was EV church founded by the Rev Andrew Heard at Erina, NSW. EV Church now has approximately 2,000 persons attending each Sunday, over 8 full-time persons on its staff, and annual revenue of over $3,500,000. The church owns 9 acres in the heart of Erina with a 1,000 seat auditorium, a 400 seat hall and numbers of class rooms for their ‘thriving’ children’s ministry (380 children) and sees around 100 converts each year. The services are informal and the church is devoted to outreach. At present, there are 30 similar independent evangelical churches, who are members of an association called the ‘Fellowship of Independent Evangelical Churches’ (“FIEC”). EV Church is the largest, while among the others, 2 full-time staff members and 400 church members is typical with services generally held in available schools and halls. Significantly, with two exceptions, transfers from other denominations have comprised less than 5% of membership. None of the members of FIEC are ‘charismatic’.

Why have the FIEC churches survived and mostly thrived whereas some local Anglican Churches have not? The Synod of the Diocese of Sydney has not allocated financial support to FIEC or any FIEC member. Some initial support has been provided by individual Sydney churches, their members and benefactors. The critical questions are: Why have these independent evangelical churches succeeded? How must regional churches, suffering from little support in the places where they are, change to survive?

A third failure of the Report is an inadequate discussion on ‘mission’ or ‘evangelism’. The word ‘mission’ is mentioned over 200 times in the report. It is never defined or explained. The Report may have assumed that ‘mission’ includes evangelism but the latter topic deserves separate treatment. In the Report, it receives none.

This leads onto a fourth gap in the Report. At no point is there a detailed analysis of any struggling rural Anglican Church. This is extraordinary given that the Report is principally a response to the problem of a declining rural church. What mission and evangelism has been conducted in the past 20 years by the clergy and laity of such churches? Is the decline taking place notwithstanding vigorous mission and evangelism? Is the decline taking place because of ineffective or inadequate mission and evangelism? The reader is left to guess.

Archbishop Carnley once described the differences within Australian Anglicanism as being so profound that in effect the ACA is –

a stratified church, almost like two churches in one. Within the Anglican Church of Australia two quite different mind-sets rub up against each other like two great tectonic plates that occasionally move and grate upon one another.

---

13 http://evchurch.info/  most leaders have had formal theological training and are or were ordained. Most trained at Moore Theological College or at SMBC, Sydney.

14 Informal services are common in Sydney. Such services generally include the following elements:

(a) A sermon. This is the major element. The sermon is biblical, commonly an exposition of a passage of scripture and usually part of a series.

(b) Bible readings, prayers, hymns and songs. These may be projected onto a screen. Prayer and hymn books are not used.

(c) Music is in a popular idiom. Organs and choirs, even if available, are not used. The singing of hymns and other songs is supported by lead-singers, guitars, drums and other instruments. Words sung or said by those present are projected onto a screen.

(d) Dress by church leaders and members is informal, e.g. at one extreme T-shirt, shorts and thongs.

15 Outreach includes every possible means of evangelism and, in particular, scripture in schools, programmes for teenagers and regular Bible studies in homes.

16 Some churches are now of a size and with financial resources such that property can and has been acquired.

17 This is not surprising as the members of local protestant churches are said to be old and prefer traditional / Anglican / older styles of worship. The two exceptions were begun by Anglicans who were dissatisfied with decisions made by the bishops of the dioceses in which they were formed.

18 Information in this paragraph was provided by EV Church and the Rev James (Jim) Ramsay and the Rev Andrew Heard.

19 Although the Synod has provided no financial support to any FIEC member, some have become affiliated with the Sydney Diocese under the provisions of the Affiliated Churches Ordinance 2005.

20 The Task Force membership included, at different times, the bishops of Canberra and Goulburn, Adelaide, Riverina, Ballarat and Bendigo. Each of these dioceses includes substantial areas of rural land and it is reasonable to assume that each of the bishops of these dioceses were aware of the condition of the Anglican Church in those areas. However, none of this information appears explicitly in the Report.

21 Peter Carnley, Reflections in Glass, (Harper-Collins Publishers, Sydney, 2004), 13. This idea of ‘two churches in one’ was expressed by Donald Robinson (Vice-Principal, Moore College and later Archbishop of Sydney) in 1956 commenting on the draft
On this view, the ACA is no longer one denomination but has become two denominations under one constitution. Given the differences canvassed in the National Church Unity Task Force Report,22 joint action possible and is there a realistic willingness to resource each other?

A fifth and glaring failure of the Report is its employment of census figures when discussing attendance and numbers of clergy. The Report provides a table displaying numbers of clergy and estimates of attendance based on Census responses which, for none of the dioceses listed, bears any resemblance to the average attendance figures provided by the dioceses and listed in the same table.23 Nevertheless, the Report relies on those estimates to provide several pages of discussion and potential conclusions regarding the number of clergy in each diocese. This discussion culminates in a list of ‘interesting trends and comparisons’ which, when reconsidered with the attendance figures provided by the dioceses (where available) substituted for the estimates, produces less compelling figures and in one case suggests the exact opposite conclusion to that reached by the Report; demonstrating the inadequacy of the Report’s statistics and its consequent analysis.24

Ironically two of the statistics derived from the Census, which would have been both natural and helpful to engage with, were largely ignored by the Report –

1) The Report indicates that, of those who responded that they were Anglican on the Census, only 6% actually attend church at least once per month. Although that figure is contrasted with the corresponding figure for Baptists (63%),25 the opportunity to engage in consideration of the changing attitudes of society to religion; the emerging clarity of the scope of ‘nominal Anglicans’ and to what extent (if any) they should be considered when assessing viability; and the question of what advantage in mission the Anglican church has as a result of the large number of nominal Anglicans; are each ignored in the Report.

2) Similarly, the Report notes that the percentage of nominal Anglicans in rural areas is higher than in capital cities.26 Although the Report is concerned principally with the viability of rural dioceses, this statistic is never examined, and consideration is not given to changed approaches to ministry that may flow from the higher proportion of nominal Anglicans in rural communities than in capital cities.

6. Supporting ministry in other dioceses

Models of co-operation in the ACA are canvassed in Chapter 4 of the Report. Most of the options canvassed involve formal agreements between dioceses, such as covenants, MOUs and arrangements for Shared Service Centres. While there is merit in considering some of these formal options, there are a number of less formal means of supporting ministry in other dioceses which we suggest should factor in plans to support and revitalise ministry in other dioceses.

Our first suggestion involves providing support by sending trained clergy. The Report does not provide enough information to draw definitive conclusions on this, but a possible inference from the tables of clergy numbers is that the increasing dependence on part-time and retired clergy may be contributing to long term decline. Where retired clergy are ‘looking after’ a parish because the parish is unable to support a full-time ordained clergyperson, the focus of their ministry is likely to be on maintaining a ministry to ‘the faithful’ rather than to grow the church through evangelism. Because they are not reaching the next generation,...

23 p. 8-029. With the exception of Sydney, in every case where diocesan attendance is provided, the Actual attendance falls in the range of 23-73% of the Census estimate. In the case of Sydney, the actual attendance is 125% of the estimate. (i.e., the estimate is never within 25% of accuracy when compared to the known figures.)
24 For example, on p. 8-029 the Report suggests that Brisbane has 2,348 Anglicans per clergy, whereas Sydney has only 933, and asks whether this means that Brisbane has larger parishes, or that its parishes can’t afford more clergy, or that its clergy work harder (than Sydney clergy). However, if the attendance figures provided by the dioceses are substituted for the estimates, it becomes evident that Brisbane has 49 attenders for every clergy, whereas Sydney has 90. A quick comparison of figures using the provided attendance figures shows that following Sydney, Armidale has the next highest number of attenders per clergy (70) with all other dioceses falling into the range of 28-60. Of the Capital cities, the next highest is Adelaide (54). These figures in themselves do not imply that any clergy in any diocese work harder than others, however they do demonstrate the inappropriateness of the statistics employed and the suggestions made as a consequence of those statistics.
25 p. 8-027
26 p. 8-027
this kind of ‘caretaker’ ministry contributes to the aging congregation profile in many churches, as noted in the Report. In a similar way, part-time clergy who balance the demands of ministry with secular employment are unlikely to have the time and energy to grow the church effectively. As already indicated in section 3 above, we believe that full time ordained clergy are integral to the long term growth of the church.

Providing full-time ministry in a ‘non-viable’ parish will require external financial support. Partnerships with BCA have proved to be a fruitful vehicle for this in the past, and are likely to be key in the future.

In terms of support that the Diocese of Sydney can provide, we believe that sending trained and experienced clergy will be more effective in providing help to struggling dioceses than sending money, which may be used to perpetuate patterns of ministry that have proven themselves to be of limited effectiveness. Provided a diocese was willing to receive them and provide a licence with acceptable conditions, Sydney may well be able to provide many experienced clergy willing to relocate to a new diocese for the sake of Christ’s mission there. We acknowledge that not all Sydney clergy would be able to make such a transition and some may be considered unacceptable. That said, there are many examples of former Sydney clergy who now make significant and fruitful contributions to parishes in most other dioceses of the ACA. Some dioceses refuse to license clergy who have trained at Moore Theological College and some bishops insist on undertakings that evangelical clergy are unable to accept. It would be beneficial for future sharing of clergy if these restrictions were removed.

Another possibility to explore is the establishment of Parish Partnerships.

The Report outlines a number of inter-diocesan co-operative mechanisms that exist across the ACA. The Report’s analysis focuses on structural and administrative initiatives and agreements entered into by various dioceses to streamline co-operation and territorial issues. It also briefly examines the role of national agencies. The question of Shared Service Centres receives considerable attention, and support is given for further exploration of this model as a way of reducing back-office costs.

Not examined in the Report is the issue of developing a decentralised model of parish-to-parish co-operation across dioceses which is based on mission rather than administration. Such partnerships are more informal but offer greater opportunity for larger, well-resourced parishes to assist parochial units elsewhere in Australia, particularly in struggling rural and regional areas. This model has strong roots in the early church in the New Testament, where wealthy communities of believers in Macedonia and Achaia assisted the saints in Jerusalem.

Indeed, the 2008 Sydney Synod passed a resolution for the Sydney Mission Task Force to examine how such partnerships might be generated. Since then a number of direct partnerships between Sydney parishes and those in other dioceses have been developed, including parishes in New South Wales, Armidale, Riverina, and the Northern Territory. These relationships are highly decentralised and often initiated by a personal relationship between individuals in each parish. Importantly, such relationships have not involved the formal diocesan apparatus. It is likely that some parishes in other large dioceses have similar arrangements.

Specific areas of assistance include –

- visiting parish teams assisting with running training programs, conferences or one-off missions for parishes in remote and regional locations,
- direct financial support for staff (e.g. one Sydney parish financially supports a children’s worker in a remote parish in New South Wales),
- visiting maintenance teams repairing buildings and infrastructure – sometimes this is also done through BCA,
- prayer and direct pastoral support of the regional/remote parish leadership team, and
- reciprocal visits and encouragement.

We submit that there is great scope for the intentional development and expansion of these kind of grass-roots missional initiatives across the ACA. Not only is the purpose of gospel mission served, but the bonds of fellowship and understanding are strengthened to great mutual benefit in a way that has deep resonance with the example of the early church.

ROBERT WICKS
Diocesan Secretary

21 April 2015
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31/14 Retention of marriage licences and same-sex marriage

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

Key points

- Provided clergy are not legally compelled to solemnise marriages other than in accordance with God’s law, clergy should continue as authorised celebrants under a form of the Marriage Act which allows for same-sex unions to be treated as marriages. However it would be open to individual clergy, for example by reason of conscience, to withdraw as an authorised celebrant in consultation with their parish.

- It would be unnecessary and pastorally unhelpful for the Anglican Church of Australia to withdraw as a recognised denomination under the Marriage Act in such circumstances.

- If clergy were ever legally compelled to conduct marriages other than in accordance with God’s law then they would realistically have no option but to withdraw as authorised celebrants and be content to offer other forms of Christian wedding celebrations or blessings for those already officially married.

Purpose

This report considers the wisdom of clergy continuing as authorised celebrants under the Marriage Act if the definition of marriage under the Act were to be amended to allow for unions of same-sex couples to be treated as marriages.

Recommendations

The Synod receive this report.

The Synod pass the following motion to be moved at Synod “by request of the Standing Committee” –

“Synod, noting the report provided in response to resolution 31/14, declares its view that –
(a) if the definition of marriage under the Marriage Act 1961 were to be amended to allow for unions of same-sex couples to be treated as marriages under the Act, and
(b) provided clergy who are authorised as marriage celebrants under an amended Act were not legally compelled to solemnise marriages other than in accordance with God’s law, clergy should continue as authorised marriage celebrants under an amended Act in order to solemnise the marriage of a man and a woman, although it would be open for individual clergy, for example by reason of conscience, to withdraw as an authorised celebrant in consultation with their parish. Further, it would be unnecessary and pastorally unhelpful for the Anglican Church of Australia to withdraw as a recognised denomination under the Marriage Act in such circumstances.”

Background

At its last ordinary session, the Synod resolved as follows –

Synod requests Standing Committee to establish a working party to consider the wisdom of clergy keeping their marriage licences if same-sex marriage becomes a reality.

The Standing Committee requested that its Religious Freedom Reference Group prepare a response to this resolution.

The Religious Freedom Reference Group approached this matter by considering nine pertinent questions and answering them in the following manner.

---

1 The members of the Religious Freedom Reference Group are Bishop Robert Forsyth (chair), Robert Wicks, Dr Robert Tong AM, Steve Lucas, Dr Karin Sowada, and the Rev Dr Ed Loane.
1. What function does the *Marriage Act 1961* play in marriage?

Following the teaching of Jesus himself, the doctrine of our church, the Anglican Church of Australia, is that marriage is a gift from God who made us male and female and said “For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh.” (Matthew 19:5)

Marriage has existed as long as there has been human society, and long before the State. The State therefore does not create marriage but recognises and orders it. For example, marriage as a contract requiring little more than the consent of the parties existed in England long before the first civil statutory legislation regulated marriage when the *Marriage Act* was passed in 1753.

The question of whether a union is in fact marriage is limited by the word of God. As the words in the preface of Anglican Services of Marriage put it, “those who marry otherwise than God’s word allows are not joined together by God, neither is their matrimony lawful in his sight.”

The *Marriage Act 1961* allows ministers of religion to be authorised celebrants who, as provided for in section 45, may solemnise marriages “according to any form and ceremony recognised as sufficient for the purpose by the religious body or organisation of which he or she is a minister.” Section 47 expressly provides that the provisions in the Act which enable such ministers to solemnise marriage do not impose an obligation on the minister to solemnise any marriage or prevent the minister from imposing conditions on solemnising a marriage additional to those provided in the Act.

2. What would change if the *Marriage Act* were amended to allow unions of same-sex couples to be treated as marriages under the Act?

If the definition of marriage was changed to allow unions of same-sex couples to be treated as marriages under the *Marriage Act* then the Act would recognise unions which in reality, that is in God’s sight, are not marriages at all. The current protection in section 47(a) of the Act which provides that nothing in the Act itself imposes an obligation on a minister who is an authorised celebrant to solemnise such unions as marriages would presumably remain. However there may be a need to strengthen such protections to avoid an obligation to solemnise such marriages arising under other laws, for example anti-discrimination legislation.

3. What problems would this new situation pose for clergy who are authorised celebrants?

There are three possible problem areas for clergy who are authorised celebrants if the Act is amended to allow same-sex unions to be recognised as marriages.

First, it may be thought that by continuing to operate as celebrants under an amended *Marriage Act*, the Anglican Minister is complicit with the change and the ideology it would now express. A change in the *Marriage Act* to recognise same-sex unions as marriages would have been made by the State with the explicit purpose of asserting the moral good of such unions and their equivalence to the marriage of a man and woman. This a Christian cannot support. This problem may be thought to exist even if the authorised clergy celebrant only ever solemnised marriages of a man and woman and never solemnised same-sex unions as marriages because the minister is still acting as an agent of the State under a definition of marriage that is false.

Secondly, the change in the Act would in effect be locking in an understanding of the nature of marriage that is at such variance from that which the Church once shared with the State that it questions the basis for future cooperation. As the recent Doctrine Commission report put it – Changing the Federal Marriage Act to allow for ‘gay marriage’ will, in fact, turn marriage into a government and societal register of sexual friendships. This will necessarily change what marriage is, not simply add to it.²

If a basically shared understanding of marriage has provided the rationale for the Church cooperating with the State in solemnising marriages in the past, it may be thought that such a change now

---
² Human Sexuality and the ‘Same Sex Marriage’ Debate A report of the Sydney Diocesan Doctrine Commission (October 2014), 43.
removes that rationale and basis for future cooperation. It was this consideration which has led the NSW Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia in July this year to ask the General Assembly of Australia to take the necessary steps to withdraw the Church as a recognised denomination under the Marriage Act if it is amended to include same-sex couples\(^3\).

Thirdly, it may be feared that once the law was changed, the refusal of clergy who are authorised celebrants to solemnise unions of same-sex couples as marriages would expose them to considerable attack in social media and elsewhere, and even legal action under future revised anti-discrimination laws. The point of withdrawing from the Act, so it is argued, would, as a matter of principle, arise upon the definition of marriage being changed rather than in response to political and/or legal attacks in the future.

Because of these concerns the question is raised whether clergy should continue to be authorised marriage celebrants under an amended Act.

4. **If clergy do not to continue as authorised marriage celebrants, can they still conduct a ceremony purporting to solemnise a marriage?**

No. Section 101 of the *Marriage Act 1961* currently prohibits a person solemnising a marriage or purporting to solemnise a marriage in Australia unless they are authorised by that Act.

5. **Will clergy without a marriage licence still be able to conduct other forms of marriage ceremony that do not purport to solemnise a marriage?**

Yes. Section 113(5) of the *Marriage Act 1961* already makes clear that “Nothing in this Act shall be taken to prevent 2 persons who are already legally married to each other from going through a religious ceremony of marriage with each other in Australia” provided they provide particular evidence to the minister of religion that they are already validly married. Section 113(7) allows a person who is not an authorised celebrant to conduct such a ceremony without committing an offence under section 101. This gives a wide freedom for clergy to conduct marriage ceremonies already officially solemnised by an authorised celebrant. In effect, it is open at present for ministers to adopt the “French model” where a registrar conducts the legal marriage and the couple undertake a religious ceremony thereafter.

6. **Is it enough to conduct other forms of ceremony or are there good reasons why clergy should be actually solemnising marriages under the *Marriage Act*?**

Although civil celebrants have overseen the majority of marriages in Australia since 1999 and in 2013 oversaw 72.5 per cent of all marriages,\(^4\) there are good reasons clergy should still be marrying people under the *Marriage Act*.

It continues the long significant engagement of the Anglican church with both the wider society and with matrimony.

It provides an important point of contact between an Anglican minister and people who are not members of the parish church. This creates opportunities for ministry for the good of the couple and their children in other ways.

It enables Christian believers to wed each other in a context of the word of God and prayer. As marriage reflects the relationship between Christ and his Church there is a special appropriateness in this.

It provides the church with a platform to regularly and unambiguously declare a Christian doctrine of marriage to all those who gather to celebrate a church wedding and to the wider society. The opportunity of prophetically declaring the Christian doctrine of marriage and in so doing critiquing the

---

\(^3\) Letter from Kevin Murray (Moderator, NSW Assembly) to NSW Presbyterian Churches dated 3 July 2015: [http://s1zg.mj.am/nl/s1zg/12474.html](http://s1zg.mj.am/nl/s1zg/12474.html)

proposed changes to the *Marriage Act* would be significantly curtailed should ministers withdraw from being marriage celebrants.

7. **If the Marriage Act were amended to allow same-sex unions to be treated as marriages and there were explicit protections against clergy being forced to conduct ceremonies or allow their churches to be so used, should clergy remain authorised celebrants?**

Here we return to the problems mentioned under question 3, and whether the good reasons for involvement with the *Marriage Act* are overcome by the problems with such involvement.

In particular we ask whether continuing to act as an authorised celebrant makes a minister unacceptably complicit with the change and the ideology of the amended Act. That question is in the end a matter for the individual conscience of each minister in consultation with their parish. However the following considerations suggest that clergy ought nonetheless to remain authorised celebrants despite change in the *Marriage Act*.

First, whatever the law of the land is, no one attending an Australian Anglican wedding service could be in any doubt as to our doctrine of marriage. All the authorised forms of service for marriage require the minister to make an explicit statement as to what marriage is and for what purposes it has been instituted by God, as well as declaring unions that are contrary to God’s word not to be joined together by God. This and other parts of the service, including no doubt the sermon as well, mitigate against the possibility that anyone would think that because the service was being conducted under an amended *Marriage Act*, our church or the minister conducting the service condoned same-sex marriage in any way.

Secondly, even if no one could be confused as to our position, is the mere fact of ministers operating under an Act that unacceptably redefines marriage sufficient reason to pull out? Is this an example of being ‘unequally yoked with unbelievers’ (2 Corinthians 6.14). Not in this case. Although there are no exact parallels, Christians often find themselves operating under legislation which explicitly allows practice with which they cannot in conscience agree. One example is Christian adoption agencies working under adoption law which also allows same-sex couple adoptions.

Thirdly, even if the changed definition of marriage does not compel withdrawal, what then of the argument that it does remove the reason to be involved in solemnising marriages under the Act in the first place because there is no longer a shared understanding of the nature of marriage? This is a far less clear matter and requires thoughtful judgment.

It raises the question as to how much agreement about the nature of marriage there needs to be for the church to be involved in registering its marriages under the Act. Perhaps the agreement does not need to be that close. A minister of religion who is an authorised celebrant only acts as an agent of the State in the limited legal aspects to do with certifying the persons to be married and with registering the marriage once performed. However in a service of marriage, as in all our authorised services and foundational documents, the couple are declared to be married “in the name of God” not “under the power of the *Marriage Act*.” Here the minister is not acting as an agent of the State but of the Church.

Indeed, while it is true that a recognition of same-sex marriages under the Act would be a significant point of disagreement between the State and the Church, it would not be the first point of significant disagreement concerning the nature of marriage. For many years the State has recognised no-fault divorce and has given de facto relationships functionally the same status as marriage. These earlier divergences have apparently not been seen as grounds for withdrawing from the Act.

Furthermore it is the couple who “wed” each other; they are not married by the minister. He or she merely “solemnises,” that is performs, the ceremony in which the two wed each other. Section 5(2) of the *Marriage Act 1961* provides that the authorised celebrant merely needs to be present at the wedding to be regarded for the purposes of the Act as “solemnising the marriage.5 The argument from lack of shared understanding may even prove too much, leading to the conclusion that no Christian couple should ever allow themselves to be married under an amended *Marriage Act*.

---

5 This was found by the Family Court of Australia in W and T [1998] FamCA 49 (7 May 1998)
Certainly the form of any amended *Marriage Act* would make a difference at this point. There have been suggestions of explicit provisions in an amended *Marriage Act* that would enable a distancing, if needed, of religious authorised celebrants from provisions enabling “same-sex marriage.” These would lessen the concerns about continued involvement under the Act.

Fourthly, it is worth thinking carefully about what message would be given by the Anglican Church withdrawing from operating under the *Marriage Act*. It is one thing to be in a situation like that in some European countries where clergy have not operated as celebrants for over two hundred years. It is entirely another to pull out unilaterally from our situation, despite the significant increase in the use of non-religious celebrants in recent years in Australia. Withdrawing as a recognised denomination under the Act could be read as petulance or a retreat from society. The big picture impact would be negative for our Christian witness. Individual celebrants withdrawing would have less impact.

Finally, as to possible campaigns of criticism and vilification for refusing to marry a same-sex couple, it is hard to know what is to be done, or if withdrawing from solemnising marriages but still conducting religious celebrations of marriage would make much of a difference. Difficulties, and even suffering, for the sake of Christ are almost unavoidable for any minister of the gospel in this world, as the example of our Lord Jesus Christ and the apostles show. And it is certainly not a reason for withdrawal from engagement from society.

In short, working under an amended Act would be much more complicated and wearing than at present, but not impossible.

8. **If clergy are ever legally compelled to conduct marriages other than in accordance with God’s law what options would clergy have?**

If this were to happen then clergy would realistically have no option but to withdraw as authorised celebrants and be content to offer other forms of Christian wedding celebrations or blessings for those already officially married.

9. **How could a minister withdraw from being an authorised celebrant, if that was desired?**

A licensed member clergy is authorised as a celebrant by the Australian Government on the advice of the Registrar of the diocese. An individual minister could ask for his registration to be withdrawn by the Registrar. However before any such step is taken, it would be appropriate for the minister to consult with his or her parish.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee

BISHOP ROBERT FORSYTH
Chair, Religious Freedom Reference Group

15 September 2015

---

Safe Ministry Board and Professional Standards Unit
Annual Report 2014-2015

(A report from the Safe Ministry Board and Professional Standards Unit.)

Introduction
1. This report is provided under the Safe Ministry Ordinance 2001 (cl 17) and the Discipline Ordinance 2006 (cl 104) for the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015 (reporting period).
2. The Diocese of Sydney has taken a multi-faceted approach to the issue of safe ministry and child protection. Broadly speaking the policy objectives are –
   (a) to exercise careful selection and screening of all clergy and church workers;
   (b) to provide clear requirements and expectations of behaviour through a Code of Conduct called Faithfulness in Service;
   (c) to provide regular and comprehensive training and support of all clergy and church workers;
   (d) to make a timely and caring response to all who are affected by abuse; and
   (e) to enact just procedures to deal with respondents and persons of risk.

Safe Ministry Board
3. The Safe Ministry Board (SMB) was established under the Safe Ministry Ordinance 2001. The SMB is tasked with ensuring that safe ministry, child protection and child abuse issues are properly dealt with throughout the Diocese. This includes development and review of practices and policies in these areas. The functions of the Board are defined in clauses 5 and 6 of the Ordinance.
4. The members of the Safe Ministry Board (SMB) over the reporting period were: the Rev Dr Keith Condie (Chair), Dr Tim Channon, Mrs Sarah Clancy (resigned November 2014), Ms Stephanie Cole, the Rev David Coy (resigned November 2014), the Rev Steven Layson, the Rev David Mears, the Rev Chris Moroney (resigned November 2014), the Rev Gary O’Brien, the Rev Janine Steele, Dr Ruth Shatford AM, Mr Alex Trevena and Mrs Kylie Williams.
5. The SMB has met 8 times in the reporting period.

Professional Standards Unit (PSU)
6. There have been significant changes to the PSU team over the reporting period.
7. Kerrie Newmarch finished in the role of PSU Chaplain on 11 June 2015. The PSU and the SMB are deeply appreciative to Kerrie for her contribution to the work of safe ministry in the Diocese. She fulfilled the responsibilities of her chaplaincy role with great warmth, empathy and skill. Moreover, her teaching abilities have brought significant benefit to ongoing training in safe ministry for those preparing for or already involved in ministry.
8. Catherine Wynn Jones has been appointed PSU Chaplain (formal title Manager, Pastoral Support and Education) to commence in late August 2015.
9. Stephanie Menear joined the PSU team on 11 December 2014 (initially working 5 days a week and then 3 days from 2 February 2015) in the newly created position of Manager, Legal Support.
10. Neil Atwood continues to serve as Safe Ministry Representative Liaison Officer, Annelie Singh as Personal Assistant and the Unit’s Administrator and Lachlan Bryant as Director.
11. In practice much of the work of the PSU derives from the Safe Ministry Board, which has the overall responsibility to encourage all parishes and other units of the Diocese to be child protection aware, compliant and responsive.
12. The Director has overall responsibility for the PSU and is responsible for the day-to-day administration of the complaints and discipline procedure for clergy and church workers (Discipline Ordinance 2006) and the National Register (National Register Canon 2007 Adopting Ordinance 2008).
13. When the PSU receives a complaint alleging abuse by a member of the clergy or church worker, the Chaplain follows up and provides a caring response to complainants and victims of abuse. The Chaplain provides pastoral support and coordinates the provision of counselling in each case. The Chaplain works closely with the PSU Contact Persons.
14. The PSU undertakes screening of all clergy appointments on behalf of the Archbishop. The screening includes a Working With Children Check through the Office of the Children’s Guardian (OCG) and a National Register check. The PSU provides ongoing support and advice to office holders, parishes and organisations in this regard.
15. Anglicare’s Case Manager for Pastoral Care and Assistance for Care Leavers provides a pastoral and caring response to former residents of the Church of England Homes and Sydney Anglican Mission Society Homes, who have complained of abuse or mistreatment during their time at the Homes. Nicky Horton commenced in this role on 20 October 2014 and works from Anglicare’s Parramatta offices, with the Rev Dr Andrew Ford, Director of Pastoral Care and Theology.

The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (Royal Commission)

16. This is the subject of a separate report to the Synod. Only limited information will be provided in this Report.

17. The Royal Commission commenced in 2013 with a stated minimum duration of 3 years. The Royal Commission has been charged with examining the sexual abuse of children in the context of institutions throughout Australia including churches and their agencies.

18. The Royal Commission presents an important opportunity for the Diocese to review both past and current practices from a ‘best practice’ perspective.

19. A Steering Committee was appointed by Standing Committee in December 2012 to oversee the response of the Diocese to the Royal Commission and to provide the Director of the PSU with a point of reference for undertaking this work.

20. Additional funding for resources to respond to the Royal Commission has been allocated which is being administered by the Steering Committee.

21. PSU files relevant to the Royal Commission and PSU policies are being comprehensively reviewed as part of the preparations for the Royal Commission and significant work is required as a result. Professor Patrick Parkinson has been assisting with the policy review work.

22. The PSU is therefore under increased pressure to keep up to date with existing work whilst carefully managing the work required in response to the Royal Commission.

23. The Royal Commission released its Interim Report on 30 June 2014. In the Interim Report, the Royal Commission confirmed that –

   (a) it requires a further 2 years (until the end of 2017) to complete its work;
   (b) it was too early for the Royal Commission to make any substantial recommendations; although recommendations concerning redress and civil litigation are expected shortly;
   (c) only 70 public hearings will be able to be completed within the time it has allowed;
   (d) of the (28) public hearings held to date themes include repeated abuse, multiple perpetrators, barriers to reporting abuse and adults that have systematically failed to protect children; and
   (e) of the cases reported to the Commission at that time –
      • 90% of perpetrators were male,
      • on average it took 22 years for victims to report abuse, with men taking longer than women,
      • on average female victims were 9 years old when they were abused,
      • on average male victims were 10 years old when they were abused.

Review of the Safe Ministry Ordinance 2001

24. In 2014 the SMB considered the Safe Ministry Ordinance 2001 and formed the view that that some parts of the Ordinance have either never been used or have become outdated. The Ordinance has been referred to the Standing Committee for review, and a review Committee has been appointed.

Website

25. The existing safe ministry website provides access to all current policies and documents related to safe ministry, child protection and professional standards. The website provides links to other important online resources such as the New Working with Children Check, the NSW Department of Family and Community Services webpage, counselling services, and contact information for other dioceses and other denominations.

26. Since the website was established in 2006 it has become outdated. Work on a new PSU website and safe ministry logo is underway. The new website will be: safeministry.org.au It is envisioned that this website will be easy to navigate, have easy to find, simplified safe ministry documents and other resources, and a special section for Safe Ministry Representatives (SMRs) with resources (including resources shared by SMRs themselves).
Archbishop’s Meetings with Survivors

27. Throughout the reporting period the Archbishop has continued to make himself available to listen to complainants and relate to them pastorally. This usually includes the making of an appropriate apology on behalf of the Church. During the reporting period there were 8 apology meetings with survivors and their family members in PSU matters and 6 apology meetings with Care Leavers.

28. These meetings are of immense value in almost all cases and survivors are appreciative of the effort taken by the Archbishop and the PSU Chaplain to arrange them.

Screening of Lay Workers

29. All paid lay church workers in the Diocese are required to apply for the Archbishop’s licence. This involves their completing a comprehensive screening and disclosure Lifestyle Questionnaire with the applicable Regional Bishop or his representative.

30. All workers in ‘child-related’ employment (including licensed ministers and unpaid volunteers) must undertake a Working With Children Check. In addition, it is recommended that parishes seek full disclosure of any relevant history and fully complete reference checks with prior supervisors or employers.

31. Persons with a criminal conviction for an offence listed in Schedule 2 of the Child Protection (Working with Children) Act 2012 (including serious sexual offences and certain other offences involving children) cannot be appointed or elected as wardens, parish councilors, parish nominators or Safe Ministry Representatives.

The New Working With Children Check

32. The New Working With Children Check (WWCC) commenced on 15 June 2013.

33. Important features of the new check include: clearances must be obtained by both paid employees and volunteers in child-related work; clearances will remain valid for 5 years; regular crosschecking with NSW police records will be undertaken; any matters of concern will result in the OCG imposing a bar; and the same clearance may be used for multiple employers.

34. All parishes are required to be registered for the new WWCC.

35. The phase in period for the WWCC in the religious sector was completed on 31 March 2015, and all parishes and organisations in the Diocese are required to be fully compliant.

36. The new WWCC requirements are –

(a) for all clergy working in the Diocese to obtain a WWCC clearance and for the parish (or the applicable organisation) to verify those clearances, (note: the Registry and the parish are both required to verify clearances of those with an Archbishop’s licence); and

(b) for all other persons who are in child-related work in parishes (or organisations), whether employed or voluntary, to obtain a WWCC clearance and for the parish (or the applicable organisation) to verify those clearances.

37. Some exemptions to the new WWCC apply. In many cases careful thought is required before an exemption is relied upon. Penalties apply for non-compliance with the requirements of the new Check.

38. Shortly after 31 March 2015 the Office of the Children’s Guardian (OCG) advised that they were undertaking an audit of the Diocese’s compliance with the new WWCC concerning volunteers in child-related work. This was similar to the audit that the OCG conducted in 2014 for WWCC compliance among all clergy and other paid workers in child-related work in the Diocese. A coordinated and sustained effort by the Registry and the PSU ensured all parishes were followed up for the information required for the audit by the end of May 2015. We are yet to be advised of the outcome of this audit.

39. Almost 14,000 workers obtained WWCC clearances across all parishes in the Diocese by the end of May 2015.

40. The PSU is assisting parishes with the implementation of the new WWCC and those with responsibility for these matters are encouraged to contact us as needed. More information about the new WWCC may be found by contacting Neil Atwood (nta@sydney.anglican.asn.au) or viewing the safe ministry website or the OCG WWCC website –

Screening of Ministry/Ordination Candidates, Clergy and Paid Lay Ministers

41. All candidates for ordination by the Archbishop are required to complete a comprehensive screening and disclosure questionnaire. This is administered by Ministry Training and Development (MT&D).

42. Ordination/ministry candidates undergo extensive assessment and screening by way of reference-checking, general psychological testing, interviews, chaplaincy supervision reports and Moore College reports. A PSU record check and National Register check are also undertaken. The Discipline Ordinance 2006 provides a mechanism for pre-ordination disclosure and consideration of prior sexual misconduct or abuse.

Training of Volunteer Lay Children’s and Youth Workers – Safe Ministry Essentials

43. The Diocese is a member of the National Council of Churches’ Safe Church Training Agreement. There are 38 independent churches and other dioceses who are members of the Safe Church Training Agreement across Australia.

44. The Safe Ministry Essentials course remains the mandated safe ministry training for the Diocese. During the reporting period the SMB endorsed the inclusion of protecting vulnerable adults in the training. This has resulted in a shift away from the exclusive focus on ministry to children that characterised the training previously, and appears to have been well received by training participants so far. The SMB considers this to be an important step towards a more holistic approach to safe ministry in parishes across the Diocese.

45. Youthworks continues to update the Safe Ministry Essentials course materials and facilitates the delivery of the training across the Diocese.

46. A Video to assist in the provision of the training that was produced in 2013 to replace the Behind Closed Doors video has started to be used in Safe Ministry Training.

47. The SMB conducted a survey of all SMRs during the first quarter of 2015 concerning Safe Ministry Training. The survey requested feedback on experiences at the local level concerning –

- the understanding of requirements for safe ministry training
- the perceived level of compliance with and support for those requirements (including any obstacles hindering compliance), and
- the content, delivery and accessibility of Safe Ministry Training.

48. The SMB noted strong support among survey respondents for an online component of the training as well as an online facility for the administration of safe ministry requirements at a parish level. Greater flexibility for Local Safe Ministry Trainers was also supported. The SMB is still considering these findings and what further work should be completed in these areas.

49. The SMB and PSU are thankful to Youthworks for their efforts in safe ministry training.

Training of Ministry/Ordination Candidates and Clergy

50. Eight Safe Ministry Modules have been developed and are being taught through Moore College, Ministry Training and Development, and Youthworks College as part of their courses and programs.

51. Following the change to the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 in 2013 requiring ministers in the Diocese to complete Safe Ministry Training once every three years, the SMB decided to include this training as part of the Diocesan triennial Faithfulness in Service Seminars conducted in June 2014. This allowed those ministers and licensed church workers who came to the Faithfulness in Service Seminars to fulfil all safe ministry training requirements for the next three years by attending the one day.

Safe Ministry Representatives

52. The role of SMRs in parishes continues to be pivotal in ensuring parishes comply with safe ministry requirements. The Safe Ministry Representative Liaison Officer (SMRLO) plays an invaluable role in supporting, resourcing and equipping SMRs in their role himself.

53. The PSU provides support and assistance to SMRs by telephone and email. There continues to be a significant level of direct enquiry from parishes and support given to them, particularly around the requirements of the New Working With Children Check.

54. Since 2008 it has been mandatory for each parish to nominate an SMR.
55. As at time of writing, around 200 parishes have provided current SMR details to the Registry. That leaves about 70 parishes (out of 270) as not having an SMR according to the Registry. However, the real number is probably closer to 8-10 as our inquiries show that a number of these churches have functioning SMRs, but have not returned the appropriate paperwork notifying the Registry of the appointment, or the Rector of the parish is fulfilling the role.

56. In early 2015 changes were made to the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 making it a prerequisite for each person appointed as the SMR for their parish to obtain a WWCC clearance which must then be verified by the parish. The Registrar was also given powers to require parishes to provide safe ministry records to the registry, and the Director was given power to remove an SMR from office for example if they do not hold a current WWCC clearance.

57. During the reporting period –
   (a) four large training sessions were held for SMRs at strategic locations across the Diocese at Wollongong, Seven Hills, Newtown and Bowral;
   (b) three parish-based audit/training sessions undertaken with new SMR’s and their Rectors; and
   (c) practical guidelines have been prepared to resource parishes in the following areas –
      • Developing local safe ministry policies in your church,
      • Overseas students as church workers,
      • Safe ministry record keeping.

58. Key messages for parishes are –
   (a) there is no requirement for the SMR to be appointed at the AGM but this should be done as soon as possible thereafter, and the Registry promptly notified of the appointment;
   (b) an SMR must have a WWCC clearance as a pre-requisite for the role which must be verified by the parish;
   (c) parishes must verify the clearances of SRE teachers that they have “employed” or authorised; and
   (d) parishes must keep their safe ministry records up to date to help keep volunteers up to date with their training.

59. Effective communication with parishes remains the single biggest issue in ensuring compliance with safe ministry requirements at the parish level. When parishes were being contacted about the OCG audit concerning the WWCC problem, for example, emails were often not opened or not actioned. Even letters to Rectors were either ignored or not processed promptly by Rectors or office staff. Poor communications between the parishes and the Registry (as indicated by the large number of parishes with no SMR listed in the Registry) has also been an issue.

60. Further important work is now being done, for example looking at whether online training for SMRs is able to be developed and whether a suitable basic record keeping database with supporting software is able to be made available to parishes to assist with meeting their obligations in this area.

The Taskforce on Resisting Pornography

61. The Taskforce on Resisting Pornography was established by the PSU in early 2013.

62. Members of the Taskforce include: the Rev Marshall Ballantine-Jones (Youthworks), Mr Lachlan Bryant (PSU Director), Mr John Burns (Senior School Counsellor and psychologist, Shore School), the Rev Dr Keith Condie (Dean of Students Moore Theological College), the Rev Patrick Jones (youth minister, Castle Hill), Mrs Nicky Lock (counsellor and Diocesan Contact Person), the Rev Gary O’Brien (MT&D), Mr Greg Powell (psychologist), and Dr Patricia Weerakoon (sexologist).

63. The Rev Marshall Ballantine-Jones was appointed Chairman of the Taskforce from 2015.

64. Although its work is only in its initial stages the Taskforce will be looking at the impact pornography has on the church and what can be done about this. A particular need that has already been identified is for better education for those in our churches on this topic.

65. In 2014 the Taskforce commissioned a survey of ministers, chaplains and licensed lay church workers across the Diocese concerning attitudes to pornography use among other related matters. The Episcopal Team has considered the survey results and further research has been commended, particularly towards effective practical measures to help to respond to the problem. An important step in beginning to raise awareness for church leaders in the Diocese was the almost exclusive focus on this topic in the afternoon sessions at each of the 2014 Faithfulness in Service Seminars.
Safe Ministry Guidelines and Other Advice

66. The PSU continues to receive inquiries about child protection and safe ministry issues from clergy and church workers in parishes. Such calls or emails are received on a daily basis with each staff member receiving at least half a dozen inquiries per week and sometimes many more than this.

Care of Survivors of Abuse and Complainants

67. It is the role of the PSU Chaplain to care for complainants and survivors of abuse by clergy and church workers. The complaints process can be long and difficult for survivors and the Chaplain provides pastoral care and support to them throughout. This important role supplements counselling and other emergency assistance which are provided to survivors from PSU funds. A caring response is the first important step along the road of healing for survivors of abuse.

Tears and Hope Service

68. Tears and Hope is a church service held each year for survivors of abuse, hosted by Ed Vaughan (rector of St John’s Darlinghurst) with the assistance of the PSU Chaplain. In 2014 it was held on 3 November. Keynote speakers included Archbishop Glenn Davies and Prue Gregory, Acting Principal Lawyer from Knowmore, a free legal service providing information to people about the Royal Commission.

Pastoral Care and Assistance Scheme

69. The Diocesan Pastoral Care and Assistance Scheme has been established to provide financial assistance to survivors of abuse to meet their needs which arise from abuse or misconduct by clergy or church workers. The Scheme is an alternative to litigation which can be a protracted and harrowing process for survivors. The Scheme includes a mechanism for external assessment if necessary.

70. Currently there are two identical schemes, one for matters that fall within the Diocesan responsibility and one for Care Leavers matters that are the responsibility of Anglicare.

71. Between 1 July 2014 and 30 June 2015 there were 12 payments under the Diocesan scheme and 10 payments were funded under the Anglicare scheme.

Abuse and Sexual Misconduct Complaints Protocol

72. Since 1996 the Diocese has used an established protocol for receiving complaints and allegations of child abuse or sexual misconduct by clergy or church workers. All Contact Persons are trained counsellors who may be contacted through an abuse report line (1800 774 945 or reportabuse@sydney.anglican.asn.au). The Contact Persons provide information and support to callers as they consider their options. The Contact Persons can then assist in the documenting and reporting of allegations or complaints of abuse or misconduct.

73. Any complainant identifying possible criminal behaviour is encouraged to make a report to the NSW Police. The Contact Person or another appropriate person from the PSU is able to assist the person in reporting the matter to the Police.

74. The five Contact Persons are Margaret Fuller (Illawarra), Nicky Lock (Northern Beaches), Sue Kreicers (Northern Suburbs), Richard Elms (Western Suburbs) and Rob Carroll (Southern Suburbs).

75. The Contact Persons meet four times a year with the Director and Chaplain for training and coordination of their roles.

Discipline Ordinance

76. The process for complaints regarding misconduct or child abuse by clergy or church workers is governed by the Discipline Ordinance 2006. The specific offences covered in the Ordinance are: child abuse, sexual abuse, unchastity, drunkenness, neglect of ministerial duty, non-payment of just debts, disgraceful conduct, conviction of a serious criminal offence, failure to report suspected child abuse and lastly inappropriate pastoral conduct involving a child (introduced by amendments made to the Ordinance by Synod in 2014).

77. Where a complaint is received by the PSU that includes an allegation of criminal behaviour a report is made to the NSW Police if the complainant is not able to make that report.

78. The Director receives complaints against clergy and church workers of the Diocese and administers the complaints process under the Discipline Ordinance 2006. Primarily complaints involve child sexual abuse or adult sexual misconduct. Each matter usually involves a Contact Person taking an initial report and complaint if applicable and offering counselling to the alleged victim. The PSU then receives the report and a file is opened. The Chaplain contacts the complainant and remains in touch with them throughout. If the complaint is properly made under the Ordinance the Director serves the complaint on the Respondent.
79. If the Respondent is a member of clergy or paid church worker they are offered counselling, a support person and payment of pre-approved legal costs should they require advice in responding. Depending on the response an investigation is conducted and the matter then proceeds to the Professional Standards Committee for review and recommendations. Unresolved matters can be referred to a Tribunal.

80. If the Respondent is an unpaid lay church worker they are offered counselling and a support person. Depending on the response an investigation is conducted and it is then referred to an Adjudicator for recommendations and final determination. Unpaid lay respondents are responsible for their own legal costs if they require legal advice or representation.

81. The strongest sanction available for lay persons is a prohibition order that prevents a respondent from engaging in ministry or being appointed to any role in the church. A member of the clergy may be deposed from Holy Orders. There are also conciliation provisions, lesser sanctions and other recommendations available in appropriate circumstances. The Archbishop or relevant church authority (in the case of an unlicensed lay person) considers the final recommendations and takes action as may be required. The Archbishop is entitled to enquire as to progress of matters and the Director is obliged to keep him informed.

Complaints

82. The Director received 5 new complaints under the Discipline Ordinance during the reporting period.

83. The Professional Standards Committee met 8 times and considered 13 matters in the reporting period.

84. Two matters were before the Disciplinary Tribunal during the reporting period.

The Professional Standards Committee

85. There are five members of the Professional Standards Committee. Under the provisions of the Discipline Ordinance 2006, the Committee’s function is to consider complaints and make recommendations to the Archbishop concerning these matters.

86. This Committee meets as required and is currently scheduled to meet every second month.

Adjudicator

87. Two matters concerning unpaid lay respondents were referred to an Adjudicator for determination during the reporting period.

Parish Recovery Teams

88. Parish Recovery Teams (PRTs) are generally available to assist parishes where allegations of abuse or misconduct by clergy or church workers have arisen. A PRT works in a parish to deal with the complex pastoral issues that arise once these matters come to light. PRTs aid those members of the parish who are affected and work towards the healing of the parish as a whole.

89. In 2007 a group of nine volunteers for our PRTs was trained by Pastor Tim Dyer of John Mark Ministries. From 2010 to 2012 a new team of nine volunteers were trained.

90. Due to numbers of Parish Recovery Team consultants being unable to continue with PRT work, due to health and other reasons, a new team of 14 have been trained throughout 2014 and 2015.

91. No PRT was deployed during the reporting period for a new matter.

Cooperation with NSW Government Agencies and Other Churches

92. The NSW Police Child Protection and Joint Investigation Squad Advisory Council meets together several times a year and the Director of the PSU continues to be a member of this Council.

93. There have been a number of meetings with representatives from the NSW Ombudsman’s Office to discuss whether the application of the Ombudsman Act NSW 1974 does or could include misconduct of certain ‘employees’ in the Diocese where the conduct is directed towards children. If the Act applies, such matters would need to be reported to the NSW Ombudsman’s Office which would provide a level of oversight and/or review in those cases. At the time of preparing this report, although work has begun on these matters, a final position has yet to be reached.

94. The Diocese continues to work together with other denominations in areas of safe ministry. One example of this collaborative approach is the National Council of Churches Safe Churches Sydney group. This group meets occasionally to focus on developing initiatives for churches in the area of child protection. The PSU Chaplain attends these meetings as the PSU representative.
95. The National Network of Directors of Professional Standards from Anglican Dioceses across Australia meets together each quarter. The Director of the PSU continues to be an active member of the Network. The Network meetings are crucial for continuing cooperation and communication between Professional Standards Directors across the nation. The value of the Network is the depth of experience concerning professional standards matters across the group as a whole. This also means the Network is well positioned to make important contributions to developments and initiatives in these areas and to work towards maintaining best practice in processes across Dioceses.

Manager, Legal Support

96. Since commencing in the position in December 2014, the Manager, Legal Support, under the supervision of the Director, has been working on the following (among other things) –

(a) policy development in response to Professor Parkinson’s review of the child protection policies of the Diocese in 2014;
(b) processing and administration of Pastoral Care and Assistance Scheme claims and implementing recommendations from a review of the Scheme in 2013 for improvements to the way the Scheme is explained and communicated to claimants;
(c) updating and drafting documents and materials for the new safe ministry website; and
(d) facilitating the re-branding of safe ministry for the purposes of the website and generally.

97. The Manager, Legal Support has been undertaking important work that existing PSU staff have not been able to attend to because of other competing work priorities. The assistance of the Manager, Legal Support has been invaluable to the PSU, and subject to availability of funding it is intended to make the role full-time at the start of 2016.

Finance

98. The SMB receives accounting reports on a monthly basis. PSU accounts are reported in the Synod Funds reports provided to members of Synod.

99. In December 2013 the Standing Committee resolved “that tribunals and other proper work of the PSU should not be abandoned because of lack of funding.”

100. In 2013 the Standing Committee agreed to fund Tribunal matters from contingencies, which therefore removes these rather unpredictable and expensive costs from the ordinary operating budget of the PSU. This is a significant step towards greater certainty for the funding of the work of the PSU and has assisted with budgeting.

101. In February 2015 the SMB passed the following resolution –

“The [SMB] asks that the Chairman and Director approach the relevant authorities to request that the Professional Standards Unit (PSU) be funded completely and adequately. The level of funding at the end of 2014 did not put the PSU in a financially sustainable position for 2015 and indeed the future. The SMB has the responsibility to encourage parishes and other Diocesan organisations to be child protection and vulnerable adult aware, compliant and responsive. The SMB relies primarily on the PSU to do the day-to-day work of implementing its policy agenda and to administer the Discipline Ordinance and provide appropriate support and care for those who have been subjected to abuse. A thorough review of the PSU in 2007 acknowledged that the unit was not adequately funded. It recommended that further staff be employed to enable the PSU to more adequately fulfil its disciplinary and support roles and to be more actively involved in matters of training, support and compliance that are so necessary in creating a culture that minimises the risk of child abuse. Furthermore, the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse has placed significant extra demands upon the PSU.”

102. A report coauthored by Chair of the Safe Ministry Board and Director of Professional Standards was sent to the Diocesan Resources Committee in relation to the matter putting the case for the PSU to be adequately funded into the future.

103. In the report it was recommended that the Diocesan Resources Committee recommend to Standing Committee that PSU costs be fully recoverable under the annual Parish Cost Recovery charge.

104. In the coming years it is crucial for the PSU to be adequately funded and resourced in order for the Unit to do its work properly and effectively.
Conclusion

105. As we approach the end of the third year since the Royal Commission was established, it is critical that the important work conducted by the PSU in preparation for and in response to the Royal Commission is completed thoroughly and effectively. It also is vital for the PSU to be fully and adequately resourced for the years to come.

On behalf of the Safe Ministry Board and Professional Standards Unit.

THE REV DR KEITH CONDIE LACHLAN BRYANT
Chair Director
Safe Ministry Board Professional Standards Unit
7 July 2015 7 July 2015

\[1\] The existing website: www.psu.anglican.asn.au and www.sydneyanglicansafeministry.com.au will be redirected to the new safe ministry website when it goes live, projected to be around the end of the third quarter of 2015.
Ordinary Session of Synod: Proceedings for 2015

2/05 Stipends, Allowances and Benefits for 2016
(A report on behalf of the Standing Committee.)

Key points
- Recommended minimum stipends increased by 4% for 2016.
- Structure of remuneration package remains unchanged.

Introduction
1. By resolution 2/05, the Synod requested that the Standing Committee report its findings about stipends and allowances to the Synod each year.
2. The circular to ministers and wardens entitled “Guidelines for the Remuneration of Parish Ministry Staff for 2016” (the “Guidelines”) was published in August this year and provides details of the recommended stipends, allowances and benefits for ministers, assistant ministers and lay ministers for 2016.

Minimum Stipends
3. Stipends are generally reviewed annually but in June 2015 the Standing Committee agreed that the increase in the recommended minimum stipends for 2016, 2017 and 2018 be limited to the lesser of 4% and the amount required to reach 80% of the latest available Average Weekly Earnings published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
4. The increase required for the minimum stipend for 2016 to reach 80% of AWE would have been 7.6%, so the recommended minimum stipends for 2016 are based on a 4% increase, giving –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 Minimum Stipend $ pa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Ministers, Lay Ministers &amp; Youth and Children’s Ministers (Theological degree or Advanced Diploma) – 5th and subsequent years</td>
<td>61,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd and 4th year</td>
<td>58,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st and 2nd year</td>
<td>55,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Children’s Ministers (Diploma) – 7th and subsequent years</td>
<td>55,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th to 6th year</td>
<td>48,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st to 3rd year</td>
<td>42,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remuneration Packaging
5. From 1 January 2015, the maximum level of stipend sacrificed to a minister’s expense account (“MEA”) has been set at 40%, with the member of the ministry staff able to set a lower percentage. Ministry staff may sacrifice an additional amount of stipend (over and above the 40%) to increase superannuation savings. Certain expenditure can be reimbursed to the minister from the MEA. Benefits received in this way are exempt from fringe benefits tax and income tax.

Superannuation Contributions
6. Contributions on account of superannuation for ministers and assistant ministers are part of the parish ministry costs and will be funded through the Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2015. Superannuation for lay ministers is paid separately. As for 2015, the amount of the superannuation contribution is generally set at 17% of the applicable minimum stipend, accordingly the annual contributions proposed for 2016 are –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>11,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Ministers, Lay Ministers &amp; Youth and Children’s Ministers (Theological degree or Advanced Diploma) – 7th and subsequent years</td>
<td>11,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st to 6th year</td>
<td>9,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Children’s Ministers (Diploma) – 7th and subsequent years</td>
<td>9,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st to 6th year</td>
<td>8,263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Travelling Allowances/Benefits
7. The diocesan scale for the travelling allowance to be paid to ministers, assistant ministers, lay ministers and youth and children’s ministers for 2016 is calculated in accordance with the following scale –
   (a) a fixed component of $8,047 (2015 – $8,047) per annum to cover depreciation, registration, insurance etc, plus
   (b) a reimbursement at the rate of $246 (2015 – $246) for every 1,000 kilometres travelled by the person concerned on behalf of the church or organisation which he or she serves.

8. Travel benefits may be provided through an MEA in lieu of a travel allowance in accordance with the guidelines published in the Guidelines.

Remuneration for Occasional Services
9. The recommended rates for clergy who take occasional services are –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For 1 service</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 2 or more services in a half day</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a whole day</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The following guidelines also apply in relation to remuneration for occasional services –
   (a) If the total return journey of the person taking the occasional service is 75 kilometres or less, a travelling allowance of 80 cents per kilometre should be paid (2015 – 80 cents). If further kilometres are travelled, the travel allowance should be negotiated.
   (b) Meals should be provided where necessary.
   (c) As pension benefits may be reduced according to other income received, the recommended rates are open to negotiation.
   (d) Where a minister is invited to take, or assist in, services in a church outside their parochial unit, any payment for services should be made to the parochial unit to which the minister is licensed, rather than to the minister.

Acting Ministers, Locum Tenens and part time pastoral workers
11. Acting Ministers, Locum Tenens and part time pastoral workers should be remunerated with reference to the relevant full time stipend and benefits on a pro-rata basis (based on a 6 day working week). The worker should also be paid a travelling allowance at the rate of 80 cents per kilometre to cover any travel costs incurred while performing their duties (2015 – 80 cents).
12. Provision for ministry related expenses, superannuation, sick, annual and long service leave (on a pro-rata basis) should be provided where appropriate and agreed upon by the worker and parish council.
13. Part time pastoral workers must generally be included under the parish’s workers compensation insurance policy.

Male and Female Student Ministers
14. The recommended assistance for student ministers working one full day per week for 2016 is –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Program</th>
<th>% of Minister’s Minimum Stipend</th>
<th>2016 $ pa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studying for a degree</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>$8,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying for a diploma</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>$6,481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a student minister works more than one full day then the rate payable is a pro-rata amount of the full day rate.

15. The following guidelines also apply in relation to the remuneration of student ministers –
   (a) Transport costs (whether private vehicle or public) should be paid by the parochial unit. Where extensive travel is involved consideration should be given to paying for the travel time.
   (b) Where a student minister serves for a half day in addition to a full day, account should be taken of the additional time and cost in travelling and care taken to ensure that the student minister is not disadvantaged by the additional expense.
   (c) Under the Fair Work Act 2009, since 1 July 2015 the national minimum wage for adults has been $17.29 per hour. This means that the recommended stipend allows for no more than 9.0 hours work per week if studying for a degree, and 7.2 hours if studying for a diploma. The minimum wage will be reviewed next on 1 July 2016.
(d) Arrangements should be made to ensure student ministers are provided with appropriate hospitality. For example, appropriate breaks should be provided especially in a long working day.

(e) Preparation time adds to the total time incurred in service for the parochial unit and should be allowed for when the amount of payment is considered.

(f) Superannuation contributions are payable if the remuneration exceeds $450 per month.

(g) Workers compensation insurance cover must be arranged by the parish.

(h) By arrangement with the student minister the parish may agree to pay college fees (tuition, boarding, etc) on behalf of the student minister in lieu of part of the normal remuneration. If such fees are paid they should be considered an exempt fringe benefit provided -

(i) the student is a ministry candidate, and/or holds the Archbishop’s licence, or is an independent candidate undertaking the same course of study as required for a ministry candidate, and

(ii) the benefit is only applied to paying fees and the provision of accommodation/board.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

JAMES FLAVIN
Chair, Stipends and Allowances Committee
14 August 2015
35/09 Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee (TEMOC)

(A report from the Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee.)

1. The Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee (TEMOC) was formed in 2009 and is responsible for the distribution of funds allocated by Synod to ministries operating in Universities and Vocational Education and Training (VET) institutions. The Committee is committed to supporting the development of evangelical tertiary ministries within the Diocese in accordance with the statement of vision, strategic priorities and core principles detailed in its report to the Synod in 2010 (refer to Synod Book 2010).

2. These are summarised below –
   (a) Vision (paragraph 9, Synod Book 2010): Our vision is to grow Bible-based ministries on each university and Vocational and Education and Training (VET) campus in the Diocese that are –
      (i) evangelistic,
      (ii) preparing students for a life-time of Christian service, and
      (iii) particularly concerned to raise up future generations of vocational Christian ministers.
   (b) Core Principles (paragraph 10, Synod Book 2010): In addition to the values in the vision above, we want these university and VET campus ministries to –
      (i) serve churches in partnership through training and equipping their members,
      (ii) as far as possible, work as a single united team on campus,
      (iii) develop effective ministry across the whole campus, including segments such as commuters, international students, postgraduates, staff and residents,
      (iv) have (Anglican) chaplains who will serve in these ministries, be recognized by the campus administration and advocate for the ministry.
   (c) Funding Model (Paragraph 11, Synod Book 2010): TEMOC funds are –
      (i) to help initiate new work on tertiary education campuses,
      (ii) to help resource campus based ministry traineeships to encourage the raising up of vocational Christian workers,
      (iii) not to be the sole funding source for any campus ministry.
      Funds are available under two schemes (with the quantum of each grant declining over a 2 to 4 year trajectory) –
      (i) theologically trained workers,
      (ii) ministry traineeships.

3. The members of the Committee are Professor Christopher Bellenger (Chair), the Rev Patrick Benn, the Rev Richard Blight (Secretary), the Rev Robert Copland, the Rev Stephen Gooch, Mrs Catherine Miers, Associate Professor Boyo Ockinga, the Rev Lisa Thompson (elected during the year) and Canon Mark Williamson.

4. Following the 2014 Synod, the Committee (having met on four occasions) has –
   (i) reviewed reports from 2014 grant recipients.
   (ii) confirmed funding allocations for 2015.
   (iii) called for and assessed grant applications for 2016,
   (iv) commissioned (with donated funds) the production of a short video illustrating the vital ongoing relationship between tertiary student evangelism and the ministry of the diocese.

5. The Committee was responsible for overseeing the distribution of the Synod allocation of $100,000 to support Tertiary ministry in 2015. As in previous years grant applications were received for projects valued at more than twice the funds made available by the Synod. The committee considered each of the applications in accordance with the statement of vision, strategic priorities and core principles.

6. For 2015 a total of ten grants were distributed. Eight of the grants were distributed to support ministry on seven University campuses and one TAFE campus, plus two grants supporting multi-campus ministries in the Broadway education precinct. All University projects were initiated by Anglican ministries in consultation with evangelical student groups on campus. Grants have assisted in the creation of a new CVET ministry at West Ryde TAFE and several continue support for positions that are less than three years old. Two of the grants support women’s ministers, one specifically supports work among international students and a total of 9 ministry trainees are being supported.
7. Funds were distributed as follows –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary Focus</th>
<th>Funds Recipient</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Ministry Focus</th>
<th>Project Contact</th>
<th>GRANT 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi- Institutional</td>
<td>St Barnabas Anglican Church Broadway</td>
<td>Theologically Trained Worker</td>
<td>Residential worker</td>
<td>Rev Mike Paget</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi- Institutional</td>
<td>St Barnabas Anglican Church Broadway</td>
<td>Theologically Trained Worker</td>
<td>International worker</td>
<td>Rev Mike Paget</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi- Institutional</td>
<td>St Barnabas Anglican Church Broadway</td>
<td>Ministry Trainees</td>
<td>Campus evangelism</td>
<td>Rev Mike Paget</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
<td>AFES - Wollongong University</td>
<td>Ministry Trainees</td>
<td>Campus evangelism</td>
<td>Rev Rob Copland</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>Unichurch UNSW</td>
<td>Ministry Trainees</td>
<td>Student evangelism</td>
<td>Rev Carl Matthei</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowbank TAFE</td>
<td>West Ryde Anglican</td>
<td>Ministry Trainee</td>
<td>Student evangelism</td>
<td>Rev Mal York</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWS Bankstown</td>
<td>AFES – UWS Bankstown</td>
<td>Theologically Trained Worker</td>
<td>Women's Worker</td>
<td>Rev Richard Blight</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWS Penrith</td>
<td>St. Philip's Anglican Church, Kingswood (UWS Penrith)</td>
<td>Theologically Trained Worker</td>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>Rev Steve Gooch</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWS Penrith / Hawkesbury</td>
<td>AFES- UWS Penrith</td>
<td>Theologically Trained Worker</td>
<td>Women's worker</td>
<td>Rev Steve Gooch</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWS Parramatta</td>
<td>AFES – UWS Parramatta</td>
<td>Theologically Trained Worker</td>
<td>Staffworker</td>
<td>Sonny Singh / Rev Peter Hughes</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FUNDS $100,000

8. Several members of the Committee have direct involvement in student ministries on campus which from time to time are grant applicants, and on occasion and after due process may also become grant recipients.

9. The Committee maintains a Conflict of Interest Register and any member with a conflict of interest does not advocate for their application in committee or vote on its approval.

10. The Committee considered reports on all the projects funded in 2014. The reports confirmed the application of funds to the specified project and provided details of outcomes achieved from grant funding.

11. Following the reception of our ‘TEMOC Report to Synod 2014 on TAFE and CVET Ministry’ the Committee developed an information sheet on the range of options available for ministry in these areas and circulated it with the invitation to submit funding applications that was sent to all rectors in June this year. At least one parish is seeking to step up its work on a local TAFE in the coming years.

12. The committee has called for applications for new and continuing projects in 2016. A total of 13 applications requesting $276,000 have been received for the first round review. Four applications are for new projects. Final decisions on grants will be made following the October meeting of Synod.

For and on behalf of the Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee.

PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER R BELLENGER
Chairman
11 August 2015
16/14 Yoga and other such activities

(A report from the Social Issues Committee.)

Key points

- Christians are called to obey the first commandment and therefore not to participate in the worship of false gods.
- Encourages discernment for the individual Christian, noting that yoga, as it is practised in contemporary Sydney, may or may not involve the worship of false gods.
- Advises churches and schools to seek alternatives to yoga if they desire to offer a program of relaxation or physical suppleness similar to yoga.

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to respond to the Synod’s request in resolution 16/14 as to whether yoga and other such activities are inconsistent with the gospel and, if so, should not be offered by our churches or Diocesan Organisations, or allowed to be held in their premises.

Recommendations

2. Synod receive this report.
3. Synod pass the following motion at the request of the Standing Committee –

"Synod, noting the report on Yoga and Other Such Activities in response to Synod Resolution 16/14, thanks the Social Issues Committee for its work on this matter and –

(a) emphasises that Christians are called to obey the first commandment “You shall have no other Gods before me” and thus must, as Christ’s disciples, avoid participating in the worship of false gods;

(b) recommends that individual Christians should exercise discernment with respect to yoga and other such practices, which may or may not contain elements of worship of other gods;

(c) advises churches not to rent out their premises to yoga classes on account of the spiritual confusion this may cause;

(d) advised schools, and other Anglican institutions not to engage in yoga and other such practices, but to seek alternative means of promoting health and well-being; and

(e) urges Anglicans, clergy and laity alike, to consider the missional significance of the widespread uptake of yoga by Australians of Western European cultural background in recent decades."

Background

4. At its session in October 2014, Synod resolved as follows (16/14) –

“Synod –

(a) notes that in multi-cultural Australia there are many activities available for public participation which are based on, or derived from, Eastern religious practices and beliefs, including yoga, tai chi, some martial arts, and dragon boating,

(b) notes that some of our Diocesan churches and organisations offer such activities or allow them to be held on their premises,

(c) notes that some Christians believe such activities are contrary to the gospel, and lead those involved in them to inadvertently worship idols and false gods, and access evil spiritual forces; and accordingly,

(d) requests the Social Issues Committee of the Diocese to report back to the next Session of Synod as to whether such activities are inconsistent with the gospel, and if so, should not be offered by our churches or Diocesan organisations, or allowed to be held on their premises."

5. This report sets out the response and thinking of the Social Issues Committee in regard to this matter. The members of the Social Issues Committee are Dr Karin Sowada (chair), Dr Megan Best, the Rev Dr
Summary of findings
6. Individual Christians should take note of their consciences in choosing to participate in yoga and other such activities, and the consciences of those who will see them so participate. They should make an informed decision about the spiritual content, and if there is an element of false worship involved, remove themselves. Specifically, yoga – as it is often practised in modern Sydney – is not necessarily problematic for believers. Due to the strongly religious nature of some forms of yoga, Christians should be sure that their practice of yoga does not involve them in false religious practice.

7. Churches and other institutions such as schools should be more cautious. This paper recommends that churches examine carefully the context that they are in, and judge accordingly; and certainly ask questions of the leader of any proposed yoga class. It would be, in our opinion, advisable in most cases for a church not to rent its premises to a yoga class.

8. Anglican Schools should investigate alternatives to yoga, such as Pilates; or should strongly consider renaming yoga classes in a suitable way (an option that one Anglican school has exercised). This keeps in mind the possible fall-out from an outright rejection of yoga, but also focuses on the physical and health benefits of the exercise, ensuring that there is no spiritual confusion.

9. The question of the missional significance of the widespread uptake of yoga by Australians of Western European cultural background should be investigated with a view to asking what this is saying about their spiritual openness (or otherwise).

10. By analogy with this examination of yoga, ‘such activities’ (Tai Chi, dragon boat racing, and so on) should be addressed carefully on their own terms. A Christian will not want to engage in the worship of any but the true God, and so should ask in each instance whether they are participating in an act of false worship.

Explanatory Note
11. The terms of reference of the question asked of the SIC (“such activities”) is extremely broad and covers a wide range of potential practices. This paper has attempted to address one such practice – yoga – and develop some principles from there.

Yoga and its Christian critics
12. Can a Christian practice yoga? Ought a Christian church rent its premises to a yoga teacher? Should a church school offer yoga?

13. For leading US evangelical commentator R. Albert Mohler, Jr., the answer is ‘definitely not’. Mohler notes how the practice of yoga has become a completely mainstream part of contemporary Western culture, such that even the US First Lady, Michelle Obama, would announce that yoga was on offer as part of the annual White House Easter Egg Roll – essentially a Presidential party for children.

14. Citing a book by Stefanie Syman entitled The Subtle Body: The Story of Yoga in America, Mohler notes that that yoga’s history is not uniform, and is extremely complex. The tradition involved thousands of gurus with an enormous variety of beliefs and practices. Nevertheless, as the practice has been introduced to the West, it has become more singularly ‘a way to stay healthy and relaxed’.

15. For Mohler, Syman’s history makes it clear that ‘yoga cannot be fully extricated from its spiritual roots in Hinduism and Buddhism’. Its arrival in the West has signalled a shift to a post-Christian era, in which a nebulous ‘spirituality’ has replaced traditional Christian adherence. Yoga’s advance ‘points to the retreat of biblical Christianity in the culture’. He concludes –

“When Christians practice yoga, they must either deny the reality of what yoga represents or fail to see the contradictions between their Christian commitment and their embrace of yoga. The contradictions are not few, nor are they peripheral. The bare fact is that yoga is a spiritual discipline by which the adherent is trained to use the body as a vehicle for achieving consciousness of the divine. Christians are called to look to Christ for all that we need and to obey Christ through obeying his Word. We are not called to escape the consciousness of this world by achieving an elevated state of consciousness, but to follow Christ in the way of faithfulness”.

---

1 http://www.albertmohler.com/2010/09/20/the-subtle-body-should-christians-practice-yoga/
“Christians who practice yoga are embracing, or at minimum flirting with, a spiritual practice that threatens to transform their own spiritual lives into a “post-Christian, spiritually polyglot” reality. Should Christians willingly risk that?”

16. Mohler’s position contra yoga is that, in the words of evangelical scholar Douglas Groothuis: ‘All forms of yoga involve occult assumptions’. Practising yoga as merely a physical activity is not possible, he argues, because in yoga body and spirit overlap completely. Thus, the Christian who engages in yoga may actually be in contradiction of what the gospel says about human nature and its relation to God. Yoga’s emphasis on meditation as ‘emptying the mind’ is, for Mohler, at odds with a Christian view of meditation, which involves contemplation of the Scriptures.

17. Mohler is sensitive enough a critic to realise that yoga as it is often practised in the West is not simply a replication of an ancient Indian practice, but is a form of syncretism. It has become something else again. But it is still, as far as he is concerned, a form of spirituality; and, as such, in contradiction to Christian discipleship, a ‘symptom of our postmodern spiritual confusion.’ This means that, for him, yoga is not simply incompatible with Christianity but actually a threat to it. Yoga distracts from Christianity, providing inferior and erroneous answers to questions of human flourishing and life after death. A Christian who practises yoga is sampling an ‘entry drug’ to a New Age spirituality which is essentially individualistic and selfish. For Mohler, the entry of yoga into the cultural mainstream is evidence that American culture has become syncretistic and decadent.

Biblical religion demands exclusive worship of the one true God

18. There is no question but that Biblical religion demands exclusive worship of the one true God. He is to be worshipped alone, and is to be worshipped according to the way he himself sets out. One must not have false gods, but it is also the case that one cannot worship the true God falsely. The syncretism of Israel receives the most vehement opprobrium throughout the Old Testament. The New Testament reasserts this message. The Gospel calls Israel to worship the true God truly, through Jesus Christ. It also calls Gentiles to abandon their worship of idols, and their syncretistic practice, and follow the true God (1 Thessalonians 1:9). There is no hint of compromise here. Idolatry is proscribed as John says: little children, keep yourself from idols (1 John 5:21).

19. Does yoga as it is often practised in the 21st century West fall under this category? Is it a dangerous practice which indicates the de-Christianisation of the participant and the society in which we live?

20. To summarise, then, the concerns, expressed by many Christians, are that –
   (a) Yoga is a form of Hinduism, a religion Christians believe to be false,
   (b) Yoga is occult, or pagan,
   (c) Yoga is spiritually distracting, and an entry drug to the New Age, and
   (d) Meditation as encouraged in yoga is an anti-Christian and dangerous practice.

The broader context: globalisation and multi-culturalism

21. In order to analyse the contemporary practice of yoga in the West, we need to step back and try as best we can to grasp the social and cultural conditions under which we labour as Christians to honour our Lord. These social and cultural conditions have also shaped the contemporary practice of yoga.

22. The late modern phenomenon called globalisation is marked by the growth of vast urban centres inhabited by diverse sub-cultures, such that each large city begins to look more like each other large city and less like it belongs to the country that it is in. The novel telecommunications technologies and airlines connect the world, and facilitate an extraordinary complex of interactions between peoples of different cultures. What has emerged, broadly speaking, is a truly global culture, in which people who might have a different skin colour or a different faith have as much in common – say, a love of Manchester United, or an interest in chess – as someone of the same skin tone and religion.

23. In addition, Mohler is right to observe that the permanently wired world has left Westerners disconnected from the more traditional forms of religion associated with their cultural heritage. Christian adherence has waned, and there is a palpable loss of faith in (and thus influence of) the mainstream Christian churches. For many contemporary people, the business of ‘spirituality’ is an individual affair. People now say in increasing numbers that they are ‘spiritual but not religious’. In the 2009 Australian Survey of Social Attitudes, the number of Australians describing

---

4 Andrea R. Jain, Selling Yoga : From Counterculture to Pop Culture.
themselves as spiritual (47%) exceeded the number describing themselves as religious (39%); and twenty-nine per cent of young people under the age of 30 described themselves as ‘spiritual but not religious’.

24. Eastern ‘spirituality’ has thus become a significant phenomenon in the West, especially since the 1960s. Partly, this is because of the lure of the exotic and the alternative. Partly this is because the practices of Eastern religion have been adapted to suit Western lifestyles and tastes. The entry of Eastern religious practices was popularised like never before with the visits of major pop stars to the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi in 1967. Connection with celebrities – people with the fame and the power and the funds to travel, and renowned for the individualism so beloved of the West – was a powerful conduit running East to West, and remains so.

25. In addition, we inhabit what we might call a ‘popular’ or ‘consumer’ culture, in which the conditions of freedom expressed through economic choice prevail. That is: Western individuals value their freedom to express their individuality through consumer choices, and will pay for authenticity and variety. For example, the availability of cuisine from around the globe is a way in which a middle-class Westerner can purchase and sample an experience that is at once exotic and yet (literally) consumable. We delight in the choice we can make between Serbian, Nepali and Peruvian cuisine, all in the one urban street, and we feel like a citizen of the modern globe as we do, sampling Serbian-ness or the alternatives.

26. A contemporary world city, like Sydney, is not a place in which a particular religion can be said to have a stranglehold. Christians who live in such an environment are called on to live with neighbours who bring with them the cultures, customs and religious practices of many different places; and they are called upon to live with neighbours who are keen to sample many of these strange new things. It is in such an environment that the contemporary phenomenon of yoga, as often practised by many Western people who have no other connection with Eastern religion, has developed.

27. In sum –
(a) the cultural context in which we live is impacted by globalisation,
(b) consumer individual choice is much prized, and
(c) there is a sense of disconnection from community and self, health and life balance in the fast-paced world.

What is ‘yoga’?

28. ‘Yoga’ is notoriously difficult to define, and even its proponents and practitioners disagree about what it is, and what it means. The Wikipedia definition reveals this complexity –

   Yoga is a physical, mental, and spiritual practice or discipline that denotes a variety of schools, practices and goals in Hinduism, Buddhism (including Vajrayana and Tibetan Buddhism) and Jainism, the best-known being Hatha yoga and Raja yoga.

29. This definition tells us that Yoga is diffuse and not linked with one particular religion. Its origins are certainly within Eastern religious systems, particularly Hinduism. The history of yoga, however, is not restricted to one religious tradition, and indeed, scholars note the malleability of yoga, as it moves from tradition to tradition.

30. This is not the place for a description of the complex varieties of traditional yoga. That is not our focus here. What we need to note is that, while yoga’s origins lie in Eastern religion and philosophy, its adaptation for practice in the West has transformed it. As Andrea Jain argues –

   Postural yoga is a ‘transnational cultural product’. 7

31. Jain contends that, while yoga undoubtedly has its origins as a form of meditation within Hinduism, yoga’s use in the US since the 1980s has undoubtedly ‘diluted its spiritual content.’ Scholar David Gordon White of the University of Santa Barbara writes –

   In the United States in particular, yoga has become a commodity. There is a gap between the ancient, “classical” yoga tradition and yoga as we know it. 8

32. Yoga, as it is often practised in Australia and like cultures, is more an American consumer product than an Indian spiritual practice. Thus, the definition of yoga offered on the yoga.org.nz website states that –

---

7 Jain, p. ix.
Yoga is a practical aid, not a religion. Yoga is an ancient art based on a harmonising system of development for the body, mind, and spirit. The continued practice of yoga will lead you to a sense of peace and well-being, and also a feeling of being at one with their environment.  

33. Westerners who practise yoga do so for the most part without seeking to engage in a deeper study of Hinduism. Yoga is marketed to consumers for its health benefits, and for its capacity to produce relaxation. Claims are made for its ability to enhance physical strength, and improve heart health. The Australian Bikram yoga website, for example, while having various ‘Eastern’ symbols in it (which gives the impression of authenticity), indicates that none or few of the teachers are of Asian or Indian background, and nothing in the material advertising Bikram yoga suggest that anything religious is on offer. Rather, the following are listed as benefits –

- “Endurance is boosted through consistent practice”,
- “Your peripheral circulation improves”,
- “Willpower, self-control, concentration and determination are strengthened in this challenging environment”,
- “Just as when your body raises its temperature to fight infection, the raised temperature in the room may assist in improving the proper functioning of your immune system”, and
- “With regular practice, discipline and honest effort you will –
  - Reshape your body
  - Reduce the risk of sports injury
  - Reduce the effects of stress
  - Clear your mind and calm your soul
  - Tone and strengthen muscles
  - Develop increased strength, balance, flexibility, coordination and endurance
  - Increase your energy level”

34. ‘Calm your soul’ is the only vaguely religious term used, although it is possible to use this word in a broad sense not indicative of any religious or metaphysical claims. The claim is often made that yoga is a ‘spiritual’ form of exercise. It is hard to know what is meant by ‘spiritual’ in this context. It is a vague word in 21st century culture, indicating perhaps a drive to inner peace and a balance of the mental and physical in one’s life. It may be offered as an alternative to ‘religious’ (see above), but not necessarily.

35. Andrea Jain notes that both Christian critiques and some Hindu advocates of yoga pursue what she calls an ‘essentialist’ definition of yoga (for which, see Mohler above). These definitions emphasise the Hindu origins of yoga, and claim that the contemporary practice of yoga, if it is to be authentic, will lead to involvement in Hindu religious practice and belief. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that Westerners are turning en masse to accept Hinduism via yoga. Indeed, a quick survey of local Christians discovered a number who have been practising yoga for a length of time and were not remotely concerned about the possibility of a compromise to their faith. One respondent, for example, wrote –

“I’ve been practising Bikram yoga for 11 years mainly for my back health but for an all over comprehensive workout. There is nothing about it that compromises my faith. Some of the instructors are a bit herbal but nothing is indoctrinated. A measure of maturity and wisdom along with a large grain of salt keeps you spiritually safe.”

36. Another said –

“From my experience, albeit limited to one location but with 4-5 ‘yogis’, they vary in the why though the exercise experience is similar. Some of the call to be in the moment and learning to respond to stressful positions by breathing and noticing, can be useful and not only in the class. What I am uncomfortable with I don't do, in terms of 'om' chanting or joining in the namaste. There are a variety of styles that I think reflect different aspects of the practice so probably worth being accurate about which practice you’re critiquing.”

---

9 [http://yoga.org.nz/what-is-yoga/yoga_definition.htm](http://yoga.org.nz/what-is-yoga/yoga_definition.htm)
11 Bikram yoga is a 1970s synthesis of Hatha yoga techniques.
12 Indeed, the Hebrew word *nephesh*, often translated ‘soul’, is like this.
13 Jain, p. 163.
14 A greeting meaning ‘I bow to the divine in you’, accompanied by a bow with the hands in a prayer-like gesture.
37. A third said –

“I am yet to find anything that offers the same physical benefits as yoga for me... I have neither
forgotten nor am ignorant about the actual origins of yoga. Doing the physical poses, stretching, etc does not necessarily equate to a link with the spiritual aspects of it. It’s a heart
matter. I know to whom my heart is connected and placing my body into a particular position
in order to stretch muscles, etc doesn’t alter that.” 15

38. What these quotations reveal is that, quite apart from any religious or spiritual component, yoga encourages the individual to self-awareness, without judgment. For Westerners, it does not necessarily point to a higher power or an alternative deity as the source of comfort and inner peace. Rather, it teaches reliance on the self for these (which may be spiritually problematic, but in a different way).

39. In conclusion –

(a) Postural yoga as commonly practised in Western cultures is not a religion, nor is it directly
religious, but it emerges from an Eastern religious background. It therefore retains some of
that vocabulary and outlook, but it is important not to assume that origins equate to
contemporary belief or practice.

(b) Yoga is chiefly sold as having health benefits for the practitioners, but does so by inviting them
to consider themselves as more than bodies. In this way, it has a quasi-spiritual component.

(c) Yoga as commonly practised aims to teach self-acceptance and inner peace through self-
discipline and self-reliance.

Scripture, Theology and Mission

The teaching of Scripture

40. Holy Scripture is adamant that the God of Israel is God without peer or parallel, and that he is to be
worshipped without compromise (Deuteronomy 6:4). The commandment that came to Israel, which was to
shape their life, was to worship Yhwh only, without addition. He was not to be introduced to a fertility
goddess and made her husband, or to be considered as an option amongst a pantheon of deities. He would
brook no rival. The challenge of Elijah to the prophets of Baal (1 Kings 18) proved that not only was worship
of another deity blasphemous, it was also futile, since Yhwh was the only true god. To enumerate the
passages of the Old Testament where Israel is condemned for allowing the shrines and temples of other
gods to flourish alongside the Temple of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the one who made the
heavens and the earth, would be exhausting.

41. The jealousy of God is one of his most definite and fierce qualities. He is no mute idol, nor is he to
be represented by the creation of idols. His exclusive love for his people, and his faithfulness to them, was
to be met with a response of exclusive worship. The holiness of the people was to be a representation of
his holiness (Leviticus 20:26). God’s choice of only them as his people, from the nations that surrounded
them, was to be mirrored by their singular devotion to him. That is to say: monotheism and election are two
companion doctrines in the Old Testament.

42. The tension for the New Testament comes with the inclusion of the once-excluded Gentiles, who
were marked by their worship of false gods and the impure practices that flowed from such worship. Jesus
Christ himself anticipates the mission to the Gentiles throughout his ministry, and then the book of Acts
records the preaching of the gospel as it travels through the Greco-Roman world. There are several
encounters with pagan religion recorded in Acts, including the riots in Ephesus because of the cult of
Artemis, and the observation of the many religious shrines of Athens by Paul.

43. At the heart of the theology of Acts, and at the heart of the theology of Paul the apostle, is the
shocking discovery that the gospel of free justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ comes first to
the Jew, and then to the Gentile; and that this means that table fellowship between the two groups was
now permissible, since the old boundary markers had dissolved. Indeed, segregation of the people of God
was unacceptable. This meant that the old scruples of the Torah about food and ritual impurity were no
longer to be required for entry into membership of the people of God.

44. Nevertheless, while Gentiles were admitted to the table, the criterion for admission was faith in the
Lord Jesus Christ – which was faith in the one Lord and God of Israel (1 Corinthians 8). That is: you couldn’t
bring your faith in pagan gods to the table! Of that, the New Testament is absolutely clear. John finishes
his first letter with the clear command: Keep yourselves from idols (1 John 5:21). Paul intensifies it in 1
Corinthians 10:14: flee the worship of idols. The exclusivity of Christian worship is not less in any way than
the exclusivity of Israelite worship – it has a singular object.

15 Quotations come from a survey on social media conducted by the author of this paper.
45. Because of the mission imperative of the gospel of Jesus Christ, however, the exclusivity of the people of God could not ever be maintained by a physical separation, or by the erection of physical barriers. Further, the abolition of Torah as a way of life for the new people of God was not replaced with a new set of religio-cultural habits. Christians were to live in the midst of the nations; and were planted in the urban centres of the ancient world, where they carried on as (it seemed) ordinary citizens. They were to live ‘such good lives among the pagans’ that their lives would be a commendation of Jesus Christ. Their gathering was a heavenly reality; and while that was to be expressed by their regular gathering with local believers, it meant also that they did not withdraw from gathering with and eating with pagans and other outsiders.  

46. In addition, the triumph of Jesus Christ means that false gods are exposed as a nullity (Colossians 2:15). It is no accident that the Reformation movement led to what Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor calls ‘the great disenchantment’.  
That is: a return to a biblical faith in the Western church led to a commensurate loss of faith in the world as a place permeated by spiritual forces. The gospel eradicates superstition where it is heard (and promotes scientific thinking), because it declares the sovereignty of God over creation and the victory of Christ over the powers and principalities. Despite some facets of the charismatic movement returning to a fascination with exorcisms and the demonic, biblical Christianity retains its focus on the word of the gospel as a declaration that the earth is the Lord’s and everything in it. For ‘everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected, provided it is to be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by God’s word and by prayer’ (1 Timothy 4:4-5).  

47. We conclude then that a Christian need not fear somehow an inadvertent taint by participating in much of what is labelled ‘yoga’. Yoga as it is often practised does not necessarily require involvement in false worship, or acknowledgement of a spiritual reality aside from the gospel. Just as a Christian can eat Thai food in a restaurant which has a Buddhist shrine, or can eat halal food prepared by a slaughterman who says prayers as he kills the animal, with no suggestion that by somehow eating in this way he or she is sharing in Buddhism or Islam or risking demonic possession, so it may well be that a Christian participating in yoga is not participating in non-Christian worship.  

48. A key passage for this discussion then is 1 Corinthians 8 -10, where the apostle Paul is grappling with the very issues we have been describing, namely: how does the Christian church express its singular holiness while living cheek by jowl with pagans – especially in a multi-cultural and cosmopolitan city such as ancient Corinth? Paul’s nuanced and subtle argument runs something like this: food offered to idols is not thereby tainted, since idols aren’t anything anyway, and if you treat it as just food then you are not committing an act of false worship. But your conscience may lead you to think that this food is somehow still tainted by its connection to idols. Therefore, do not eat it. Likewise, use your freedom to make sure that other believers are not tempted to break with what their consciences are telling them. Refraining from eating meat is preferable to wounding another’s conscience. And if that is so, then something very grave is going on. It is a very serious thing to think you are participating in the worship of false gods, because idolatry turns out to be demonic, and provokes the Lord to jealousy.  

49. Paul’s priority is what eating communicates. By arguing that Christians should do all ‘to the glory of God’, he is urging that believers seek the good of the other ‘so that they may be saved’ (1 Corinthians 10:33). Believers should not naively compromise themselves by participating in the worship of idols. But they should also develop a strong conscience by realising that idols are nothing. Paul is not concerned with the taint that objects are said to carry: he is concerned about what people think about such objects to which a particular sacredness is ascribed. It is the subjective, rather than the objective, aspect that is his concern when it comes to eating meat. In 8:10, for example, Paul notes that some ‘with knowledge’ may eat in the temple of an idol in liberty, without compromising their faith – but that in doing so they may lead others into very grave sin.  

Putting Scripture into practise  
50. The question is to what degree the practice of yoga is analogous to eating food served to idols. We certainly live in a multi-cultural and cosmopolitan setting akin to first century Corinth. Increasingly, Christians have to live in a world in which East and West overlap and cannot be easily separated. On the one hand, secular Westerners dabble in quasi- or pseudo- Eastern practices like postural yoga with no thought to the religious or spiritual aspect of it. At the same time, our cities are filled with people who come from cultural backgrounds where these things do have a specific religious and spiritual meaning.

---

17 Christians are right to consider carefully the apparently religious aspects of various activities, but an overly tender conscience in this area may make us blind to our complicity in businesses, activities and communities in which human sinfulness is perpetuated. The New Testament calls greed a form of idolatry (Colossians 3:5) after all – there is a spiritual significance in that which is apparently basely material.  
51. What one communicates to the culture by participating in something like yoga may be very different depending on the background of the person. The analogy is then possibly relevant because, for some people in modern Sydney, yoga does mean participation in a particular alternative religious practice. Paul would be quick to say that a strong conscience would have no problem with the yoga as it is often practised here. The knowledge that Christ is Lord and the powerful presence of the Holy Spirit in the Christian body are the trump cards here. The Christian should keep her eyes and ears open for moments when her faith will be challenged or compromised; but then that might be the case in any activity outside the church, not simply one with a quasi-religious/spiritual component.

52. For the sake of the conscience of the other, however, a Christian person or a Christian organisation may wisely choose to forgo the practice of yoga. This takes careful discernment of the kind that Paul encourages us to pursue in 1 Corinthians 8-10, and of which this paper is hopefully a model. There is not a straightforward answer here. What may be fine for an individual may, because of a differing context, be questionable for a church or school. For example: there is no objective problem with an individual Christian practising yoga as it is commonly practised in contemporary Sydney. She may choose, however, if friends of hers understand her practice of yoga to be a participation in the worship of a false god, to lay down her right to practise yoga. This will take an individual's discernment of particular situations.

53. A school or a church will say more than an individual by their endorsement of yoga. Can a church rent out its hall to a yoga practitioner? At one level the answer depends on the practitioner, but we think there is nothing in principle against that possibility - whereas, we think there would definitely be a very obvious problem with renting the hall out to, say, a witches' coven or a Buddhist meditation class. Yoga doesn't necessarily fall into that category. What may govern the decision of the church is the message that renting out the hall to a yoga class may send to the community, especially given the multi-cultural context. Is it suggesting that syncretism is okay, or tacitly endorsing false worship? A school is in an even more responsible situation, since it is charged with the nurture of young souls. Is there a way of having the benefits that yoga offers – relaxation, physical suppleness, an awareness of one's health, and so on – without the suggestion that an Eastern spirituality has been endorsed? We believe compromises are possible here, but also that the principle of conscience as outlined in 1 Corinthians 8-10 should be the guiding one.

54. It is worth adding that for many secular people a Christian rejection of yoga may be in itself a stumbling block. That is (and this is certainly true at an anecdotal level at least) perceived Christian fussiness over yoga can cause a bewilderment and anger that obscures the gospel. It appears as if the Christian is overly fearful of what, to the secular mind, is nothing at all. That contradicts what Christians want to declare about the clear victory of Christ over the spiritual realm.

55. The attraction of yoga for the community raises questions about the philosophy of the self that it promotes, and whether and how this opens up the possibility for gospel conversations. To focus on yoga as a practice contrary to the gospel (which we don't believe it necessarily is) rather misses an opportunity to ask why it is that yoga has become so attractive. There are points of contact between yoga and the gospel, and points of clear dissonance. A good doctrine of creation and the resurrection body allows us to see that we are never whole as persons unless we include our bodies. The technological world often treats human beings either as machines or as disembodied brains. We live in a world with an inability to find relaxation or peacefulness. There is no rest. The natural rhythms of day and night, the seven day week, and the round of the seasons simply do not exist for the inhabitants of the urban landscape. Yoga offers a moment of physical calm, a discipline for those who are yo-yoing between hyper-work and hedonism. It also offers a respite in a world in which people are being constantly evaluated and judged.

56. The Christian gospel does teach us of a kind of rest, but it also teaches us of a restlessness, too. The 'peace of God which passes all understanding' comes from the merciful, gracious sovereignty of God expressed in the gospel of Christ. We are offered an unsurpassable security. But a Christian ought also to feel the true burden of the present age: that she is scared by sin herself, and that the world is a world in open rebellion against the creator. The Christian liturgy invites us to confess our sins as we approach God and find in him 'no condemnation', not because we are fine as we are, but because what we are has been transformed. We do not find a point of self-acceptance, but are introduced to a moment of God-acceptance.

57. The Church is not the provider of all a human being needs. It is not a separate political world, or a separate economy. It does not exist to run exercise classes or open hospitals. It may do these things, and many churches have, where they are lacking. But it exists for the human being as a redeemed creature. That is: finding that Christians are getting something out of yoga does not necessarily mean that churches should start stretch classes! Nevertheless: it is worth asking why the holistic and physical aspects of yoga don't find their equivalents in the version of Christian spirituality being offered in our churches today. Are we really practising and preaching the peace of God? Is our Christian faith disembodied, like so much of Western life, or even opposed to the body in some way? How do we help people who are in the throes of...
stress, or burdened by chronic illness? Doesn’t the Christian gospel—and the practice of Christian faith—offer us help in these moments of crisis? Further discussion of these questions is beyond the scope of this paper.

Conclusion

58. In conclusion, we cannot underscore enough the imperative for Christians to not engage in the worship of any other god than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is no room for any kind of compromise or nonchalance on that front. We cannot worship him truly and participate in the worship of any other. With the example of yoga as practised in contemporary Sydney, it is by no means clear that false worship is being undertaken. In some circumstances it may be; in others it may well not be. Yoga has been actively secularised by its proponents; but in many cases religious elements may remain. This calls for careful discernment by Christians and by Christian leaders.

59. As such, we recommend that Synod pass the following motion—

“Synod, noting the report on Yoga and Other Such Activities in response to Synod Resolution 16/14, thanks the Social Issues Committee for its work on this matter and—

(a) emphasises that Christians are called to obey the first commandment “You shall have no other Gods before me” and thus must, as Christ’s disciples, avoid participating in the worship of false gods;

(b) recommends that individual Christians should exercise discernment with respect to yoga and other such practices, which may or may not contain elements of worship of other gods;

(c) advises churches not to rent out their premises to yoga classes on account of the spiritual confusion this may cause;

(d) advised schools, and other Anglican institutions not to engage in yoga and other such practices, but to seek alternative means of promoting health and well-being; and

(e) urges Anglicans, clergy and laity alike, to consider the missional significance of the widespread uptake of yoga by Australians of Western European cultural background in recent decades.”

For and on behalf of the Social Issues Committee.

KARIN SOWADA
Chair
20 July 2015
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Financial statements and Auditor's report

1. Financial statements and auditor's report referred to in clauses 9 & 10 are attached [not reproduced here].

Charities Group Status Report

2. Legal Name – Georges River Regional Council
   ABN – 6793244579
   No other entities under the organisation's control
   Entity is registered as a charity with the ACNC
   An annual information statement has been given to the ACNC
   An annual financial report is not required.

Charter

3. The Georges River Regional Council was constituted under the Region's Ordinance 1995 and its functions, powers and duties are as established by clause 6 of that ordinance. The Region covers the Mission Areas of St Georges, Bankstown and Liverpool in the Diocese. Two new Mission areas will be added to the Region in 2015.

Access

4. The Principal Office of the Georges River Regional Council is St Andrew's House, Sydney Square, Sydney, NSW 2000 (PO Box Q190, Sydney 1230) and the phone number is 9265-1530. The business hours are Monday to Friday, 8.30am to 5.00pm. The Honorary Secretary is Mr Michael Toull (phone 9773-1549) and the Honorary Treasurer is Mr Richard Graves (phone 8020-0734).

Members

5. The members of the Regional Council as at December 2014 were as follows –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>No. meetings held in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Peter Tasker (Chairman)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdeacon Ian Cox</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Lisa Bateup</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Richard Graves</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rev Stephen Frederick</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rev M Powell</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr David Power</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Michael Toull</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rev Jason Veitch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structure

6. The significant committees are the Executive Committee and the Oversight Teams, and the Council’s organisation and Committee structure is as follows –

```
+ Executive

Committees

Oversight Groups

- Regional Women’s Minister
- Regional ESL Coordinator
- Punchbowl
```

7. The senior officers of the Council are –
   - Acting Chairman – Bishop Peter Tasker
   - Vice Chairman – Archdeacon Ian Cox
   - Honorary Treasurer – Mr Richard Graves
   - Honorary Secretary – Mr Michael Toull

Activities

Synod Report on 2014

8. The Regional Council had four meetings in 2014 and all were held in parishes within the Region. At the meetings, the Rector of the parish was invited to give a Bible study and then report on the activities within the parish. This gave the Council a good indication of the challenges facing the parish and highlighted that different strategies had to be implemented to face some of the challenges of a changing society.

9. One of the challenges in the region is to connect with women from other cultures especially in those suburbs where there are a number of new settlers. A number of women working with the Rev. Margaret Powell have been able to connect with women in the Bankstown Mission area. Most of these women have been involved in the Mentac program which encourages and equips people for serving people in a multicultural context. As a result of Mentac and the experience of working cross-culturally, a number of students have considered and volunteered to work with missionary organisations. Margaret’s leadership and experience is a valuable contribution to this ministry.

10. We are thankful to God for the financial and prayer support given to Margaret Powell from Anglican Deaconess Ministries, parishes in the diocese and individual donors that support this work.

11. The church planter at Punchbowl, Mr Siddique Paul, has continued to reach out to people in the community especially new settlers from the sub-continent. A regular Bible study has begun and meets in the Punchbowl Church hall. Mr Paul contributes to the Mentac program as well as explaining to interested people the differences between Christianity and Islam.

12. During 2014 and early 2015, the honorary Bishop of the Region conducted five Presbyter ordinations. The ordinations were conducted in the local church where the candidates served. These occasions were a great encouragement to all.
   - The Rev Edison Wee at Cabramatta
   - The Rev Gary Dibley at Panania
   - The Rev John Bartik at Panania (for Revesby)
   - The Rev Greg Ball at Hurstville Grove
   - The Rev Ross Ciano at Marrickville
   - The Rev Jason Veitch at St George North

13. The ESL Coordinator, the Rev John Bartik has developed a number of aids for English class teachers for the region and the diocese. He has developed and promoted the ‘OkayEnglish.org’ website which many have found helpful in preparation of English lessons. ESL classes’ still provide an excellent platform for parishes to serve the community and to assist people to understand the person and work of the Lord Jesus. Mr Bartik visits ESL classes, provides evaluation for the teachers and conducts training courses for teachers.
14. There are still many challenges in the region, especially in the Bankstown Mission area where there is so much sociological change. Some new strategies have been developed in the region over the years and we continue to pray and look to the Lord to give the growth through these strategies.

Financial Results

15. Following is a short summary of the results for the 2014 Financial Year and the Budget for 2015 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Budget 2014</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Budget 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADM Grant re Women's Muslim Ministry</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM Grant re MTM Staff</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Ministry Services</td>
<td>6,574</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations re Women's Ministry</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations re Punchbowl Church Plant</td>
<td>13,939</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-1,061</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Income Belfield -capitalised</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>-6,300</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Income Belfield - available</td>
<td>20,879</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Income Hurlstone Pk - available</td>
<td>5,194</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>-106</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Income Liverpool - available</td>
<td>17,961</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>-339</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>16,759</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain from Regional Conference</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137,557</td>
<td>126,200</td>
<td>11,357</td>
<td></td>
<td>103,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Budget 2014</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cultural - ESL Coordinator</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Revesby and Greenacre Parishes</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Property Expenses</td>
<td>-4,373</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>-7,273</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Ministry to Muslims</td>
<td>109,764</td>
<td>107,943</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Expenses – Women's Ministry</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTM Staff</td>
<td>25,737</td>
<td>21,214</td>
<td>4,523</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punchbowl Church Planter</td>
<td>61,297</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>226,711</td>
<td>225,773</td>
<td>938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excess of Income over Expenditure

-89,154 -99,573 10,419 -86,500

Explanation of significant variances

A. ADM agreed to support staff member for another year
B. Ordinance revision means that we no longer need to capitalise part of income
C. Under budget due to reallocation of rates from 2008-13 (5309) and expense for current year (925).

Liquidity Report

16. The members of Georges River Regional Council submit the following information –

(i) we are of the opinion that, at the date of this report, there are reasonable grounds to believe that our Organisation will be able to pay its debts as and when they fall due;
(ii) adequate provisions have been made (including but not limited to, provisions for employee entitlements);
(iii) all trade creditors are being paid in accordance with normal terms of payment;
(iv) all dealings with real and personal property (including money) have been consistent with the trusts on which the property is held;
(v) no payment has been made to a member (other than in the capacity of an employee of our Organisation);
(vi) satisfactory systems of Internal Control and Risk Management have been maintained;
(vii) appropriate types of insurance and levels of insurance cover are held for all insurable risks having regard to both value of assets and current levels of awards for damages;
(viii) no matter has arisen since the end of the Financial Year which could have a significant effect on the Organisation, other than as mentioned above.

Risk Management Report

17. The Georges River Regional Council now conducts an annual risk management audit.

18. Two major risks are –

   (a) Misappropriation of money invested for the Regional Council.

   (b) No real outcome for grant monies distributed.

We have sufficient checks and balances to minimise these risks.

This report has been adopted at a duly convened and constituted meeting of the Organisation on 12th May 2015.

For and on behalf of the Georges River Regional Council.

PETER J TASKER            RICHARD GRAVES
Chairman            Treasurer

16 June 2015
Proposal to change the status of the provisional parish of Liverpool South (Holy Trinity) to a parish

(A report of the Georges River Regional Council.)

Proposal

1. The Minister and Wardens of the provisional parish of Liverpool South propose under Clause 4 of the Parishes Ordinance 1979 that the provisional parish be reclassified as a parish.

2. The various requirements for this proposal under Clause 4 and 6 of the Parishes Ordinance have been met and the details of this follow.

Support of the Georges River Region Regional Council

3. On the 12th May 2015 the Georges River Region Regional Council resolved to support the request that the Parish of Liverpool South be classified as a parish under the Parishes Ordinance 1979.

Parish Information

Historical Background

4. Holy Trinity Anglican Church (now known as Liverpool South Anglican Church) was formed through the amalgamation of three local churches: St John’s Anglican Church in Lurnea, St Alban’s Anglican Church in Casula and St Stephen’s Church in Prestons in 1979 with a vision to reach and serve.

5. The present location for the Liverpool South Anglican Church was selected for its centrality to the three older centres of worship, and also to growing population moving into the area to maximize outreach initiatives. When the parish was formed out of St Luke’s in Liverpool, it was categorized as “Assisted Provisional”, however attained Provisional Parish soon after.

Community Profile

6. The parish encompasses three suburbs (Casula, Lurnea, and Prestons) with a combined population of 37,605 people. The parish of Liverpool South is situated within a region that is considered to be one of the fastest growing areas within Australia. Its population is also very diverse with Lebanese the largest immigrant group (Lebanese 5.7%, Iraqis 4.3%, & Fijians 2.4%) in Lurnea. Whereas in Casula and Prestons the Fijian and Indians constitute the largest immigrant groups (Casula: Fijians 3.8% and Indians 2.4%; Prestons: Fijians 7.4% & Indians 3.1%). It should be noted that in Prestons approx 4% of the population are Filipinos, and a high 40% of the population were born in a Non-English Speaking country. Of those born overseas, the most common birthplace is Iraq.

7. The aim of the parish is to encourage one another to know and trust Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. It is also committed to sharing the message of hope found in the Bible to those in its community and beyond.

8. The current ministry team consists of Reverend Manoj Chacko, Deryck Rivers (Hon. Associate Minister), Caleb Rivers (Youth Worker), Margaret Hall (SRE & Ministry Co-ordinator) and Monish Gunalan (Music Ministry). The team is committed to sharing the message of hope found in the Bible to members of the church and to those in the community.

Activities

9. Sunday Services: two services are held each Sunday, at 9.30am and 5.30pm. The morning service is largely attended by adults and families from multi-cultural backgrounds and the evening service is mainly attended by young adults and youths.

10. Home Groups: a network of groups meet weekly to study the Bible and its relevance in a small group context. It additionally aims to promote prayer and closer fellowship that would not be possible through attendance at the 9.30am and 5.30pm Sunday services alone.

11. Children’s and Youth Ministry: the parish is serious about reaching children and youth in the area with the good news of Jesus Christ and teaching them to follow him. Sunday school is held at 9.30am. A team of dedicated parish members are presently involved in teaching Special Religious Education classes in three local primary schools, covering ten different classes. There is also an active youth program where young people between the ages of 11- 18 years meet on Friday evenings.

12. School of Music: as part of community outreach, free keyboard, guitar, drums and vocal lessons are provided each week. This initiative is to draw musically talented community members from the area into church and learn a musical instrument from well-trained and qualified parish musicians. These classes will give opportunities for gospel conversations to be initiated with students and also their parents and 25 young people attend the Wednesday classes.
13. Ministry to Asylum Seekers: This ministry that began in 2010 helping several Pakistani refugees, now reaches out to people from Sri Lanka and lately Cameroon in central Africa. A fellowship meeting is held fortnightly where, through the support of Anglican Aid & Anglicare and other Christians, we are able to meet the practical needs of these vulnerable people in the community. These lunchtime meetings on Sundays are well attended.

14. When the Sri Lankan asylum seekers were initially released into the community, the church provided internet and Skype facilities to enable them to communicate with their families. It also provided the opportunity for the church to be familiar with their family background and situations and extend appropriate help.

15. Partnership based ministry: The parish supports Church Missionary Society through its prayers and financial support. The Sampson’s at Nairobi, Kenya are the Link Missionaries. The parish members also support Wycliffe Translators, the pioneering work of Bible translation by Phil & Lil in West Asia.

16. In recent years the parish has made two mission trips to visit, share and learn from the church planting organization, India Gospel League. This has widened the eyes of the members to see and learn from what God is doing in His world.

17. Malaysia Discipleship Centre, a church based ministry from Malaysia have been partnering with us by giving us a wider mission perspective. Locally, we are involved in supporting the local outreach to people of Jewish background, through the ministry of Jews for Jesus.

18. Facilities on Site: The main hall for weekly gatherings is spacious seating 200 members and equipped with modern sound system, musical instruments and multi-media equipment.

19. The large hall adjacent is suitable for fellowship meetings, functions and dinners. It is used several times during the week as an outreach venue to connect with the local community.

20. Several large meeting rooms are also located on site.

21. The Rectory is situated adjacent to the large church car park. This rectory meets the diocesan standards of four bedrooms, a minister’s study, two bathrooms, and a large kitchen and dining area.

22. For staff housing or for temporary accommodation by asylum seekers.

23. Regular attendance during the last 12 months are as follows –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning Service (9.30am)</td>
<td>80 (ages 18 &amp; above). 15 (under 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Service (5.30pm)</td>
<td>8 (above 18), 15 (under 18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Growth Plans**

24. As a parish we are committed to proclaiming Christ as Saviour and Lord and living out the Kingdom of God in the local community. We will be involved in the Diocesan Mission initiative of seeing Christ in the community through Mission 2020. A couple of new housing and land developments are taking place in the parish, in Casula and Prestons. Plans are underway to look at ways to connect with the new residents moving into these areas.

**Particulars of church property**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Value of Land and Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>$1,507,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>$76,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of consolidated receipts and payments**

25. A summary of the financial position over the past two years is set out below –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offertories</td>
<td>$125,066</td>
<td>$133,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest/Investments</td>
<td>$7,457</td>
<td>$6,276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ordinary Session of Synod : Proceedings for 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>$44,602**</td>
<td>$10,235*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$177,125</td>
<td>$149,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Staffing</td>
<td>$125,364</td>
<td>$101,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Cost Recovery Charge</td>
<td>$20,711</td>
<td>$24,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for Ministry</td>
<td>$6,803</td>
<td>$4,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Donations</td>
<td>$5,843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Administration</td>
<td>$5,852</td>
<td>$5,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses re Parish Property</td>
<td>$12,552</td>
<td>$14,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$177,125</td>
<td>$149,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Contributions made by members for mission and sub-continental ministry
** Includes monies from savings

26. The parish has no outstanding debts.

**Recommendation**

27. The Georges River Region Regional Council recommends that the provisional parish of Liverpool South be reclassified as a parish with effect from 1 January 2016.

For and on behalf of the Georges River Region.

PETER LIN
Bishop of the Georges River Region

20 July 2015
Northern Regional Council Annual Report for 2014

(A report from the Northern Regional Council.)

Introduction
1. The Council met four times during the year, in March, June, August and November at the parishes of Willoughby, Waitara, West Ryde and Artarmon respectively.

Membership
2. The membership of Regional Council and details of the membership are as follows –
   - The Rt Rev Chris Edwards (Chairman)
   - The Rev Terry Bowers
   - The Rev Ernest Chau
   - Mr Fred Chilton
   - Ms Stephanie Cole
   - The Rev Keith Dalby
   - The Rev Michael Kellahan
   - The Rev Robin Kinstead
   - Dr Rob Mackay
   - Ms Jane McNamara
   - The Rev Ian Millican
   - Mr Jim Peet
   - Mr I Steward
   - The Rev Mal York
   - The Rev Peter Tong

3. The Regional Council has a simple structure represented by three office holders –
   - Chairman – Regional Bishop
   - Treasurer – Mr I Steward: qualifications – B Com., Chartered Accountant
   - Secretary – the Rev M Kellahan

4. Significant committees –
   - Regional Architectural Panel
   - Multi-Cultural Ministry Committee
   - Ordinance Review Committee

Regional Events 2014
5. Chris Edwards’ consecration as Bishop of the Northern Region: the Rev Chris Edwards was consecrated as Bishop on 29 March and began this ministry on 5 May. We welcome his leadership which he is exercising with energy, pastoral concern and godly wisdom and experience.

6. A big thanks also to the Ven Terry Dein who increased his working hours during the interim and enabled the region to continue to function effectively.

7. In October Terry Dein retired and the Rev Chris Burgess took up the position of Executive Assistant to Bishop Edwards.

8. Regional Conference – The Regional Conference in 2014 was held at St Anne’s, Ryde on 19 May. The speaker was Dr Alan Craddock. Because the date of the conference was so close to the two-day Faithfulness in Service conference it was decided to run a shortened regional conference. Although well attended, the shortened timeframe did limit the value of the conference. Thankfully Alan’s input lifted our time together and made the day very worthwhile.

9. Faithfulness in Service Training Update – A day conference was held at St. Anne’s, Ryde on 3 June for clergy and lay people in Christian leadership within the Northern Region.

10. Archbishop’s Lectures – For the past ten years, Abbotsleigh School has hosted the three consecutive Wednesday evening meetings. The school has been of enormous assistance over the years and the region has very much appreciated its ready generosity. However, it was decided at Council that these lectures would not be held in 2015. The Lectures may be resumed in the future and the NRC are considering alternatives including a symposium at a suitable, convenient location (Robert Menzies College?) with a variety of luminaries as panelists in a Q&A format.

Regional Council Matters
11. Meetings in 2015 – In considering the four priorities of the Mission, the Northern Regional Council decided to hold its four 2015 meetings with the following themes –
   - February  Reach the Lost
   - May  Deepen Spiritual Foundation
   - August  Equip Our People
   - November  Respond to Changing Faces of Society.
12. The Bishop encouraged Council (and individual parishes) to think about how the Mission might be implemented on a parish by parish basis.

13. Regions Ordinance 1995 – The question of a review of NRC membership was raised in order to comply with changes following the formation of Mission Areas. This was referred to the Bishop for his consideration and the changes required to meet compliance were made.

14. The regional accounts for the year incurred a deficit of $5,155. This result was effected by a decision by Regional Council to make the $10,000 grant to West Ryde to continue support of the church’s international ministry in 2014.

15. At 31 December 2014 the Council had net assets of $41,752 comprised mainly of cash balances with Glebe. The full audited accounts for the Council are tabled at Synod. The 2014 Annual Information Statement for the ACNC has been lodged.

Reports to Council

16. Philadelphia Chinese Anglican Church (PCAC) – Philadelphia Chinese Anglican Church meets at St Martin’s, Killara, pastored by the Rev Carson Wu, under provisional parish oversight of the Rev Matt Heazlewood, Senior Minister of Killara. Existing arrangements with St Martin’s were affirmed. There is the possibility of PCAC becoming an independent church in the next 3-5 years.

17. Cross-Cultural Ministry – Mrs Trish Bell is the Northern Region Cross-Cultural Consultant. The Council regards this as a highly strategic ministry and appreciates Mrs Bell’s deep commitment to it. Many groups are now conducting Bible studies after ESL classes, and other churches are working hard to welcome non-English-speaking persons into their congregational life.

18. Northern Region Multicultural Ministry Committee – This group works hand in hand with the ESL ministry. It exists to serve the ministers and parishes of the Northern Region, through the strategic development of networks and resources for multicultural ministry. Its three aims are –

   a. to inform of needs, opportunities and challenges for multicultural ministry
   b. to encourage ministers and parishes to engage in multicultural ministries
   c. to facilitate multicultural ministry through networking, resourcing and training.

19. The committee met during 2014 under the chairmanship of the Rev Chris Burgess. They had decided in 2013 to prepare and run a multicultural ministry seminar for each of the four Northern Region Mission Areas. The first seminar was held with Ryde Mission Area in November 2013. Two further seminars were planned with Upper North Shore Mission Area (held March 2015) and Warringah Mission Area in 2015.

20. The Rev Mike Kellahan reported on the partnership bond East Roseville has formed with the Rev Alby Lam and his church, Grace Anglican. This group functions as an “approved” congregation.

Other Matters

21. Regional Architectural Panel (NRAP) – During the year the Rev Chris Burgess became Chairman when Archdeacon Terry Dein retired in October. The Council places on record its great appreciation for Terry’s chairmanship of the panel.

22. Current membership of NRAP is Mrs Jenny MacDonnell; Mr Geoff Deane; Mr Dugald MacKenzie; Mr Graham Watt (new in 2015); and the Rev Chris Burgess. The panel still has a vacancy for a clergyman.

23. The task of architectural panels is not an easy one. The NRAP strives to serve parishes and provide expert advice that will result in the best possible ministry outcomes. The panel also has a responsibility to take a long-term view as it represents the diocesan interest in property matters. Sometimes this involves the NRAP in negotiations with parishes where there are differing points of view. This is most common where projects are large and expensive.

24. The region owes a great deal to the panel members who freely give of their time and expertise in assisting parishes to get the best possible ministry outcomes from their property developments.

25. Regional Grants – As noted above the parish of West Ryde was given a grant of $20,000 during the year 2013 to facilitate the integration of the Meadowbank International Church into the parish. Council also agreed to provide a further grant of $10,000 for 2014, subject to a satisfactory review.

26. NSW Government Community Building Partnership Grants – Eight parishes had their grant applications approved by the NSW Government in December 2013 for projects to be completed in 2014. These grants totalled $110,486. The details are as follows –
27. It is encouraging to see these successful grant applications from the parishes in the region. These initiatives will result in improved church facilities and many will have a direct beneficial impact upon parish ministry. The Community Building Grants provide a valuable opportunity for parishes to improve facilities, especially those which serve the wider community. They are opportunities which parishes need to intentionally seize.

For and on behalf of the Northern Region Council.

CHRIS EDWARDS  
Bishop of North Sydney  
14 July 2015
South Sydney Regional Council Annual Report for 2014

(A report from the South Sydney Regional Council.)

Introduction
1. The Council met on two occasions in 2014 on each occasion at St Andrew’s House.

Membership
2. As at 31 December 2014 membership of the Council was –
   The Rt Rev Robert Forsyth (chairman) Mrs Elisabeth Boyce
   The Rev Andrew Bruce Mr Ken Breakspear
   The Rev Matthew Johnon Dr Robert Claxton
   The Rev Dave Rogers Miss Tiffany Davy
   The Rev Dominic Steele Mr Robert Freeman
   The Rev Mark Wormell Mr Gilbert van der Jagt
   Ms Alicia Watson

3. In the course of the year the Council accepted with regret the resignation of the Rev Chris Braga.

Parishes
4. After lengthy discussions and representations from those intimately acquainted with the ministry on Norfolk Island, Council noted with pleasure the appointment of the Rev David Fell as the first full-time chaplain to the Church of England on Norfolk Island for some time. This initiative will play a crucial role in the revitalization of the ministry on Norfolk Island. It was agreed that the Council would provide partial funding for the position for the first five years. South Sydney Regional Council agreed to provide the following financial support to enable this to take place. $50,000 in 2015, $48,000 in 2016, $44,000 in 2017, $36,000 in 2018, and $24,000 in 2019.

5. After discussion in Council and consultations with the Archbishop, it was noted that Grace City Church in Redfern would proceed as an ENC church in the region.

6. Council finalised the amalgamation of St Philip’s York Street and Holy Trinity, Millers Point to be known as the Parish of Church Hill and that schedule 2 of the Parish Administration Ordinance would apply.

Other matters
7. Revisions to Regions Ordinance 1995 – Council noted that these revisions came into effect on 13 October 2014. As South Sydney has only three mission areas, with one clergyman and one lay person to be elected from each area, it was resolved in accordance with clause 4(1)(d) of the ordinance that regional council could appoint 6 additional members to bring the total number of members to 12.

For and on behalf of South Sydney Regional Council.

HUGH T. COX
Assistant to the Bishop of South Sydney

14 July 2015
Western Sydney Regional Council Annual Report for 2014

(A report from the Western Sydney Regional Council.)

Charter
1. The Western Sydney Regional Council was constituted under the Regions Ordinance 1995 and its functions, powers and duties are as established by Clause 6 of that ordinance.

Access
2. The Principal Office of the Western Sydney Regional Council is St Andrew’s House, Sydney Square, Sydney, NSW 2000 (PO Box Q190, QVB Post Office 1230) and the phone number is 9265-1519. The business hours are Monday to Friday, 9.00am to 4.00pm. The Regional PA is Miss Kirsty Grugan and the Honorary Treasurer is Mr Andrew McLachlan.

Membership
3. The members of the Regional Council as at December 2014 were as follows –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rt Rev IY Lee</th>
<th>Mrs V Brasington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev R Cunningham</td>
<td>Mr K Fairfax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev T Oakley</td>
<td>Dr R James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev G Peisley</td>
<td>Mr A McLachlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon M Williamson</td>
<td>Mr Ross Pendlebury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main committees are the Executive Committee, the Ordinance Review Panel and the Architectural Panel.

Structure
4. The officers of the Council are –

- Chairman – Bishop Ivan Lee
- Honorary Treasurer – Mr Andrew McLachlan

There are no regional staff employed by the Council.

Activities
5. The Council met on 2 occasions during 2014 at St Stephen’s, Penrith. The main areas of consideration included the reclassification of Katoomba parish, grants to the parishes of Auburn (St Phillips) and Lithgow, the regional ministry conference, parish consultancies, the relocation of the Dundas church site, and the draft new Diocesan Mission.

Regional Grants
6. A grant of $5,000 was given towards the reinvention of the parish of St Phillip’s Auburn. It was agreed that a long standing loan of $17,820 for the revitalisation of the parish of Lithgow become a grant.

Finances
7. The Council has no borrowings. The financial statements and auditor’s report for the period ended 31 December 2014 have been submitted to the Diocese.

Risk Management
8. The key identifiable risk to the Council is the misappropriation of funds and inadequate insurances.
9. The policy of the Council for withdrawal of funds is approval by two authorised signatories to the accounts. Financial reports are provided to each meeting of the Council. All insurances are maintained through Diocesan policies.

Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission Act 2012
10. The legal name of the Council is the Anglican Western Sydney Regional Council, and the Australian Business Number is 40852468035
11. The Council is registered as a charity with the ACNC.
12. The required Annual Information Statement has been completed and receipt has been acknowledged by the ACNC.

For and on behalf of the Western Sydney Regional Council.

IVAN LEE
Bishop of Western Sydney

1 July 2015
Proposal to change the status of the provisional parish of Glenmore Park to a parish

(A report of the Western Sydney Regional Council.)

Proposal

1. A proposal is being made to the Archbishop by the minister and wardens of the provisional parish of Glenmore Park, under clause 4 (1) (b) of the Parishes Ordinance 1979.

Details of Meeting

2. The Western Sydney Regional Council met on 27 August 2015 to consider the proposal under clause 5 of the ordinance. Council certified that all requirements under clauses 4 and 6 have been complied with and recommends that the provisional parish of Glenmore Park becomes a parish from January 2016.

Parish Information

3. Anglicans have been meeting in Glenmore Park since 1992, with the current brick building (& extension) dedicated in 1997 (& 2010). The parish became independent in 2000.

4. In 2000 the parish became provisional. The organised church plant took place in 1992, under the Rev Peter Hayward. In December 1996, the Rev John Lavender was appointed. Under God, steady growth has continued from this time with one 9.30am congregation expanding to two morning congregations (8.30am & 10.15am), as well as two evening congregations at 5pm and 7pm. The parish has been self supporting since 2000.

5. Due to the sacrificial effort of many people, a wide ministry base has developed including children, youth & young adult ministries as well as ministries to men, women, seniors and families. In addition, there are several partnerships, links with Compassion & partnership with Kileleshwa Covenant Community Church in Nairobi, Kenya.

6. With the generous giving of many people, the parish is now supporting 3 part-time workers as well as 8 full-time workers. In the four years since the completion of a new church extension, the church has also seen significant growth in numbers and ministry opportunities. The church is grateful to God for a generous Diocesan grant and congregation giving to support the cost of a church extension creating a new auditorium as well as various meeting rooms.

Future Plans

7. In the coming years the Parish plans to further develop the disciple making ministry culture of the church so that under God it can continue to grow and equip new and more mature disciples.

Size of Congregations

8. Average attendances (Adults and children) are currently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15am</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particulars of all church trust property

9. Details of property held by the Anglican Church Property Trust upon trust for the provisional parish are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value of Land</th>
<th>Value of Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rectory</td>
<td></td>
<td>554,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>2,526,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church &amp; Hall Contents</td>
<td></td>
<td>294,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of consolidated receipts and payments

10. A summary of the financial position over the past 3 years is set out below –
11. The Western Sydney Regional Council recommends that the provisional parish of Glenmore Park be reclassified as a parish with effect from 1 January 2016.

For and on behalf of the Western Sydney Regional Council.

IVAN LEE  
*Bishop of Western Sydney*  
15 September 2015
Wollongong Regional Council Annual Report for 2014

(A report from the Wollongong Regional Council.)

Introduction

1. The Wollongong Regional Council met 4 times during 2014 on the evenings of 4 February, 13 May, 16 September and 4 November. The meetings are held in Wollongong with each meeting preceded by a meal. The Executive sub-committee also met four times during 2014 to consider matters delegated to it and to plan agendas for the regular Council meetings.

Membership

2. In 2014 the membership of the Council was –

Rt Rev Peter Hayward (Chair)
Rev Dr Michael Blake (Macarthur)
Mr Paul Burns (Wollongong Nth)
Rev Rob Copland (Wollongong Sth)
Mr Mark Cottom (Southern Highlands)
Rev Anthony Douglas (Shoalhaven)
Mr Peter Evans (Southern Highlands)
Mrs Amanda Garlato (Sutherland)
Mr Andrew Guile

Mr Greg Holmes
Mr Geoff Kyngdon
Mr Glenn Murray
Rev Neil Percival
Mr Doug Philpott
Dr Stuart Quarmby
Rev Stephen Swanepoel
Mr Ron Webb
Mr Tony Willis

3. Following the review of the Regions Ordinance at the 2014 October Synod, the reconstituted Wollongong Regional Council membership as elected is –

Meetings attended / 4

| Chairman  | Rt Rev Peter Hayward | 3 |
| Clergy    | Rev Stephen Carlisle (Sutherland) | 3 |
|           | Rev Dr Michael Blake (Macarthur) | 2 |
|           | Rev Rob Copland (Wollongong Nth) | 1 |
|           | Rev Stephen Swanepoel (Wollongong Sth) | 1 |
|           | Rev Stephen Fifer (Southern Highlands) | 3 |
|           | Rev Anthony Douglas (Shoalhaven) | 4 |
| Laity     | Mrs Amanda Garlato (Sutherland) | 3 |
|           | Mr Ron Webb (Macarthur) | 4 |
|           | Mr Mark Cottom (Wollongong Nth) | 4 |
|           | Mr Geoff Kyngdon (Wollongong Sth) | 4 |
|           | Mr Peter Evans (Southern Highlands) | 2 |
|           | Mr Andrew Guile (Shoalhaven) | 2 |

Non-member secretary – Mr Tony Willis (Assistant to Bishop)

Ministry Strategies

4. Bishop Peter Hayward and the Regional Council worked closely to further support ministry across the Region. This included –

- financial support for the ministry at Oran Park
- financial support with subsidised rectories at Sussex Inlet and Harrington Park
- financial support with subsidised demountable at Helensburgh and Denham Court
- meeting with and support of Mission Area leaders
- support for Rectors
- 3 day Regional Ministry conference with Archbishop Glenn Davies, Rev Peter Moore and Rev Peter Orr
- Support of the Gong Men’s Day and SWITCH Women’s Conference
- ongoing support for ESL English classes
  - ESL classes were delivered in 15 Parishes across the Region
because Cross Cultural Ministry funds are not allocated to the Wollongong Region, ESL classes are coordinated by Tony Willis.

- ongoing support for Indigenous Ministries
  - Pastor Michael Duckett linked with St Peter’s Campbelltown in partnership with the SAIPMC.
  - Mr Phil Miles linked with All Saints Nowra in partnership with the SAIPMC.

5. During 2014 the position of Assistant to the Bishop was part funded from the Diocese and part from the Wollongong Region. Funding from the Region’s assets was also allocated to the specific ministry in Oran Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Staff</td>
<td>Salary Contributions</td>
<td>$48,979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran Park</td>
<td>Housing and salary support</td>
<td>$57,845</td>
<td>$106,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The Regional Council has partnered with the Mission Area leaders of the Region to plan for ongoing ministry. The Council receives regular feedback regarding the broader mission taking place in the Region.

7. The three day Wollongong Regional Ministry Conference continues to be a “high point” in the life of the Region. This enables clergy and lay parish staff to meet together for mutual fellowship and teaching. Various guest speakers (including the Archbishop) and Diocesan organisations joined in the conference.

8. The Council received reports from Bishop Hayward and the Assistant to the Bishop at each meeting.

Compliance

9. The Wollongong Regional Council is not involved in borrowings. Audited statements of accounts are attached [not reproduced here].

10. The Charities Group Status Report / ACNC Annual Return is attached [not reproduced here].

11. The Wollongong Regional Council is established under the Regions Ordinance 1995 amended 2013 and serves the Wollongong Region of the Diocese of Sydney under this Ordinance.

12. The principal office is located at 74 Church St Wollongong. Phone: 4201 1800. Office times are Mon-Fri 8am to 5pm, however there is no secretarial support at the Office.

13. Compliance with the Diocesan Governance Policy will be addressed in the report to the 2017 Synod.

Liquidity

14. The members of Wollongong Regional Council submit the following information –

(i) the members are of the opinion that, at the date of the report, there are reasonable grounds to believe that the Wollongong Regional Council will be able to pay its debts as and when they fall due;

(ii) as the Council has no employees provision is not made for entitlements

(iii) all trade creditors are being paid in accordance with normal terms of payment;

(iv) all dealings with real and personal property (including money) have been consistent with the trusts on which the property is held;

(v) no payment has been made to a member;

(vi) satisfactory systems of Internal Control and Risk Management have been maintained;

(vii) appropriate types of insurance and levels of insurance cover are held for all insurable risks having regard to both value of assets and current levels of awards for damages; and

(viii) no matter has arisen since the end of the Financial Year and the date of this report which could have a significant effect on the Organisation

13. Risk Management

15. Key risks to the Organisation are –

- a crisis in the financial markets impacting invested funds
- misuse of grant monies allocated to Regional bodies / parishes

16. A summary of the main policies and procedures in place to manage the key risks –

- investments are made in line with Diocesan policy
- a system of reporting on use of grant monies is in place
17. Financial reports and reports on application of grants are made regularly to the members. For and on behalf of the Wollongong Regional Council.

PETER HAYWARD
Bishop of Wollongong

TONY WILLIS
Assistant to the Bishop of Wollongong

30 June 2015
40/10 Implementation of the Grievance Policy and Procedure

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

Key points

- At the request of the Synod, a review was undertaken of its existing policy for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour by clergy and church workers.
- The review concluded that while the existing policy has not been widely used, it remains important to have in place a uniform policy across all parishes to deal with such allegations.
- A new policy is proposed which retains the basic elements agreed by the Synod in 2010 but in a substantially rewritten and restructured form to increase accessibility.
- The main changes under the proposed policy include providing that any conciliation process at the local level should be informal and requiring the Regional Bishop to review the available options for dealing with an allegation, if the matter is referred to him. This may or may not involve a process of diocesan conciliation.
- The proposed policy also provides that unacceptable behaviour is any conduct which falls short of behaviour expected of clergy and church workers in the Diocese.

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is –
   (a) to inform the Synod of the outcome of a review of its existing Grievance Policy and Procedure requested by the Synod in resolution 40/10, and
   (b) to propose that the Synod adopt a revised policy for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour by clergy and church workers in parishes as a consequence of that review.

Recommendations

2. That the Synod receive this report.

3. That the Synod pass as a policy of the Synod the *Diocesan Policy for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour* as attached to this report (the “proposed policy”).

4. That, if the Synod passes the proposed policy, the Synod pass forthwith the following motion to be moved “by request of the Standing Committee” –
   ‘Synod –
   (a) determines that the *Diocesan Policy for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour* (the ‘policy’) commences on 1 January 2016 and that the existing *Grievance Policy and Procedure for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour by clergy and church workers in parishes* ceases on that date, and
   (b) requests that a copy of the policy be circulated to all rectors and parish councils for their attention and that parishioners be made aware of the policy, and
   (c) requests that the Regional Bishops be offered training to undertake their responsibilities under the policy, and
   (d) requests that the Regional Bishops report annually to Standing Committee on such training received for their policy responsibilities and on their use (or otherwise) of the policy and model procedures, and
   (e) authorises the Standing Committee to make amendments to the policy provided any amendments are reported to the next ordinary session of the Synod, and
   (f) requests the Standing Committee to undertake a review of the policy after a period of 5 years from its commencement, and
   (g) requests the committee appointed to review the *Discipline Ordinance 2006* to consider whether the *Offences Ordinance 1962* should be amended to include as an additional offence for clergy and other church workers “repeated and unreasonable behaviour
directed towards a staff member or volunteer worker in a parish that creates a risk to
the health or safety of that person".

Background

5. The Synod passed the Grievance Policy and Procedure for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour by clergy and church workers in parishes (the "existing policy") on 19 October 2010.

6. By resolution 40/10, the Synod, among other things, requested the Standing Committee to undertake a review of the existing policy after a period of 3 years from its commencement on 1 July 2011.

7. On 23 June 2014, the Standing Committee appointed a committee comprising Canon Sandy Grant (chair), Mr Michael Easton, Bishop Chris Edwards, Ms Michelle England and Ms Stephanie Cole (as the appointee of the Safe Ministry Board chair) to review the policy. Due to other work undertaken by the committee (ie. preparing a revised definition of “bullying” under Faithfulness in Service which was adopted by the Synod at its session in 2014), the Standing Committee agreed to defer the review of the existing policy until the Synod session in 2015.

Feedback on operation of the Grievance Policy

8. For the purpose of undertaking its review, the committee obtained feedback on the operation of the existing policy from the Regional Bishops (being the effective gate-keepers of the existing policy at a diocesan level) and from persons appointed to the pool of Diocesan Conciliators under the existing policy.

9. Feedback from the Regional Bishops can be summarised as follows –
   3 of the 5 Regional Bishops indicated they had not formally used the existing policy with the other 2 Regional Bishops indicating they had.
   While no numbers concerning the frequency of using the existing policy are available, the frequency of use is likely to be low.
   The reasons offered by the Regional Bishops for the infrequent use of the existing policy included –
   - the processes are too bureaucratic and difficult to use,
   - a perception that the processes are weighted in favour of rectors,
   - the risk that persons who make a complaint will be re-traumatised,
   - the perception that it is often easier (or perhaps more godly) just to give in, to endure, or to leave the parish rather than engage with the processes of the existing policy,
   - a preference for many Christians (including Bishops) to handle things more relationally even though in formal terms the existing policy offers a non-legal process, and
   - Regional Bishops will often attempt to do the conciliating job themselves on a more informal basis.

10. When asked what improvements might be made to the existing policy, the Regional Bishops offered the following suggestions –
   - increase the role of the support person to include the possibility of their offering advice to the person they are supporting,
   - remove the requirement for Regional Bishops selecting Diocesan Conciliators only from a Standing Committee-appointed pool,
   - provide in-service training for Diocesan Conciliators and Bishops in relation to the existing policy,
   - reinforce the existence and availability of the existing policy,
   - a general simplification of the existing policy would be helpful (although an alternative view was that it needs to remain at the current level so as to retain a sense of seriousness for what is going on), and
   - remove the more neutral language of “allegation of unacceptable behaviour” and replacing it directly with terms used in Faithfulness in Service, particularly bullying, harassment, emotional abuse etc.

11. From the brief survey of those appointed to the pool of Diocesan Conciliators under the existing policy, it would appear that none who responded to the survey had been asked to act as a conciliator by a Regional Bishop. Comments made by Diocesan Conciliators include –
   - The existing policy is good in principle but perhaps not in practice. There are parish issues where it could perhaps have been applied but some Regional Bishops may prefer to handle these issues themselves “pastorally” rather than instigate a formal procedure.
The existing policy is not well known within churches but perhaps this is because people access these options when the need arises as opposed to being given more general prominence.

**Threshold questions for the committee**

12. In light of this feedback, the committee considered the following threshold questions –
   (a) Is it necessary to retain any policy for the purposes of dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour in parishes?
   (b) If such a policy is to be retained, how much time and effort should be put into reviewing the document?

13. The committee concluded that it remains important to have in place a uniform policy across all parishes in the Diocese as a statement of our on-going and collective commitment to treating allegations of unacceptable behaviour seriously and dealing with them in a manner which reflects biblical principles of care and fairness. Such a policy also assists parishes meet their responsibilities under Work Health and Safety legislation. The alternative is to repeal the existing policy and to ask parishes to develop their own procedures. Given our shared reputational risk in this area, the committee does not think this is a helpful alternative.

14. The committee also concluded that, in light of our experience of the existing policy to date, a fairly extensive review was necessary to demonstrate we have taken reasonable steps to improve the way we handle allegations of unacceptable behaviour in parishes. A “light-touch” review would not suffice.

**Proposed policy**

15. The proposed policy retains the basic elements agreed by the Synod in 2010. However given the extensive redrafting and restructuring required to make the document more accessible, the committee considers that the Synod should adopt a new policy rather than attempt to amend the existing policy.

16. The committee also wants to acknowledge feedback provided by the Director of Professional Standards which resulted in efforts to use plainer English in the proposed policy and to reduce the concentration of legalistic-sounding language. The Director also drew the committee’s attention to the Protocol for Addressing Grievances used by the Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn. The committee found a number of the features of this document helpful in preparing the proposed policy.

17. The following comments explain the main changes included in the proposed policy.

**Scope of policy**

18. The proposed policy provides that “unacceptable behaviour” means any conduct which falls short of the standard of behaviour expected of clergy and church workers. This includes, but is not limited to, bullying behaviour. At present “unacceptable behaviour” is defined only by reference to certain discrete categories of behaviour, namely bullying, emotional abuse, harassment, physical abuse and spiritual abuse. In proposing this change, the committee is seeking to address a real problem which emerged during its review, namely what to do with genuine concerns about behaviour which do not neatly fit into any of the current categories.

19. This change is likely to give greater significance to the statement (included in a similar form in the existing policy) that the proposed policy should be understood in light of the standards, guidelines and terms used in *Faithfulness in Service*, being the code of conduct for clergy and church workers in the Diocese.

**Structure and content**

20. In response to feedback that the existing policy is too bureaucratic and difficult to use, the proposed policy has been significantly restructured under the following main headings –
   - Purpose of this policy
   - Application of this policy
   - Relationship to *Faithfulness in Service*
   - Our commitment
   - Policy principles
   - Model procedures.

21. Appended to the main policy document is a flow diagram showing the model procedures and accompanying notes for the procedures.
Policy principles

22. Despite feedback which suggests that intentional use of the existing policy and its procedures is fairly infrequent, the committee considers that the principles in the existing policy are generally sound. These have therefore been essentially reproduced in the proposed policy with two main changes.

23. Firstly, in response to feedback from the Bishops, the committee agrees there would be benefit in increasing the role of the support person in any conciliation process under the policy (principle 10). One challenge in making any conciliation process under the policy more effective is minimising the potential for a power imbalance between the parties during the process. Giving support persons an increased role in speaking on behalf of the person they are supporting should go some way to addressing this issue.

24. Secondly, the principles have been modified to better reflect the reality that in some cases it is not appropriate to deal with an allegation using a process of conciliation (principle 12). In this case the policy indicates that other more appropriate options for dealing with the allegation should be considered. Principle 12 has no counterpart in the existing policy.

Model procedures

25. The approach taken in the proposed policy is to set out the model procedures as a flow diagram in one appendix with accompanying notes referenced in the flow diagram. This compares with the much lengthier written procedures for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour under the existing policy set out in Appendix 3 and a diagrammatic summary of these written procedures in Appendix 2.

26. The proposed policy provides that the local conciliation process should be informal. This enables some of the detail previously contained in the procedures for local resolution of a matter to be omitted from the proposed policy. The intention under the proposed policy is that if the senior minister is unable to reach a mutually acceptable outcome through an informal process of local conciliation, he should discontinue the process. This then opens the possibility of the matter being referred to the Regional Bishop for consideration.

27. Under the proposed policy, if a matter is referred to the Regional Bishop, he must –

(a) satisfy himself that direct and local resolution of the matter has been adequately considered, and
(b) if satisfied, review the available options for appropriately dealing with the allegation.

28. The available options include those set out in item 5 of the notes which accompany the procedures.

29. The formal pool of persons approved to be appointed as diocesan conciliators by the Standing Committee under the existing policy is disbanded under the proposed policy. This permits the Regional Bishop to appoint any person competent in conflict resolution and conciliation to undertake a diocesan conciliation. However the Regional Bishop retains the ability to conciliate the matter himself with the agreement of both parties.

Dealing with serious bullying allegations

30. If an allegation of serious bullying is made against a church worker in a parish, it is likely that the processes of conciliation under the proposed policy will be an inappropriate means of dealing with the allegation.

31. The committee is aware of the difficulties in escalating the resolution of complaints too quickly. However the need to avoid escalating a matter too quickly needs to be balanced with the ability to take appropriate and decisive action in response to bullying behaviour which risks the health and safety of those in a parish workplace. A failure to respond appropriately to such behaviour is taken seriously by the courts and others responsible for administering work, health and safety laws.

32. The committee has attempted to address this issue in part by including in the notes which accompany the model procedures a number of graduated options for dealing with allegations which are not appropriately dealt with under a conciliation processes. In particular, one option is that the allegation be dealt with by the relevant employers in the parish workplace (ie. the senior minister and wardens) as a work, health and safety matter. Another option is to make a complaint (presumably of disgraceful conduct) under the Discipline Ordinance 2006. The choice between these two options is likely to depend on a number of factors. These include the willingness/ability of the senior minister and wardens to deal with the allegation (for example, if the allegation is made against a member of the clergy, the senior minister and wardens may not have the ability to remove or even suspend such a person from office). Other factors would be the seriousness of the allegation and whether it is likely that the conduct alleged constitutes “disgraceful conduct” for the purposes of the Discipline Ordinance 2006.
33. Because of the uncertain scope of the offence of “disgraceful conduct”, the committee considers that it may be desirable to provide a more explicit path for dealing with allegations of the most serious bullying under the *Discipline Ordinance 2006*. To this end it is suggested that the committee appointed to review the *Discipline Ordinance 2006* be asked to consider whether the *Offences Ordinance 1962* should be amended to include as an additional offence for clergy and other church workers “repeated and unreasonable behaviour directed towards a staff member or volunteer worker in a parish that creates a risk to the health or safety of that person”. This reflects the definition of bullying used in Safe Work Australia guidelines.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

SANDY GRANT  
*Subcommittee Chair*

15 September 2015
Diocesan policy for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour

The Bible says a lot about the responsibilities of Christian life and leadership, especially about grievances between Christians.

The Bible expects high standards of Christian leaders (Mark 10:42-45; 2 Timothy 2:14-26; Titus 1:5-9; James 3:1-2; 1 Peter 5:1-4). In particular, 1 Timothy 3:2-3 says –

Now the overseer is to be above reproach, faithful to his wife, temperate, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach, not given to drunkenness, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money. (NIV)

Christians are to honour those God has placed in positions of authority (1 Timothy 5:17-20; Hebrews 13:7, 17). For example, 1 Thessalonians 5:12-13 says –

Now we ask you, brothers and sisters, to acknowledge those who work hard among you, who care for you in the Lord and who admonish you. Hold them in the highest regard in love because of their work. Live in peace with each other. (NIV)

Underlying all this – especially in the face of a grievance – are the priorities of love, repentance and forgiveness (Matthew 18:15-17; Galatians 5:22-6:4; Colossians 3:12-14; James 1:19-21). Ephesians 4:31-32 says –

Get rid of all bitterness, rage and anger, brawling and slander, along with every form of malice. Be kind and compassionate to one another, forgiving each other, just as in Christ God forgave you. (NIV)

PURPOSE OF THIS POLICY

The purpose of this policy is to encourage people in our parishes to deal with allegations of unacceptable behaviour in a wise and godly way. It encourages people to seek reconciliation, with repentance where needed.

APPLICATION OF THIS POLICY

The policy applies to allegations of unacceptable behaviour by clergy or church workers in parishes of our Diocese.

“Unacceptable behaviour” means any conduct which falls short of the standard of behaviour expected of clergy and church workers. This includes bullying.

However, allegations of sexual misconduct and misconduct involving children must be referred to the Director of Professional Standards (or a Contact Person appointed by the Director). The Director will determine whether action should be taken under the Discipline Ordinance 2006 rather than this policy.

Allegations of conduct which breach a standard in Faithfulness in Service where the person by or on whose behalf the allegation is made has suffered harm or is at risk of harm must also be referred to the Director of Professional Standards.

The policy does not apply to allegations of criminal conduct or professional misconduct. Allegations which may involve such conduct must be referred directly to the Director of Professional Standards. The Director will report such allegations to the police or relevant professional association, as appropriate.
STANDARD OF BEHAVIOUR

The standard of behaviour expected of clergy and church workers in our Diocese should be understood by reference to –

- *Faithfulness in Service* as adopted by the Synod, which is the code of personal behaviour for clergy and church workers in our Diocese, and
- The *Discipline Ordinance 2006*, which makes certain types of behaviour by clergy and church workers an offence under the rules of our Diocese.

OUR COMMITMENT

Everyone in a position of leadership in our parishes is expected to exercise authority in a godly way. And we thank God for the godly leadership of both clergy and church workers in the Diocese.

But we also recognise that sometimes authority can be exercised in an unacceptable way.

This can cause significant damage to relationships, undermine ministry and ultimately bring the gospel of our Lord Jesus into disrepute.

We are committed to ensuring that allegations of unacceptable behaviour are dealt with properly. An important part of this commitment is to have a process to encourage people to raise allegations of unacceptable behaviour by clergy and church workers in parishes, knowing that the allegations will be –

- treated seriously and sensitively, and
- dealt with promptly, fairly and effectively.

We affirm that faithful Christian leadership sometimes means clergy and church workers make decisions with which some people disagree or are offended by. Christian leadership like this can be a necessary part of growing our churches. In itself, it should not give rise to an allegation of unacceptable behaviour under this policy.

POLICY PRINCIPLES

These principles apply to allegations of unacceptable behaviour under this policy –

1. A concern about unacceptable behaviour by clergy or a church worker in a parish should be raised as soon as possible. This can be a difficult step. The person who is concerned about the behaviour may want to seek advice from a wise Christian friend on a confidential basis first.

2. Allegations of sexual misconduct or misconduct involving children usually cannot be dealt with under this policy. Such allegations must be referred to the Director of Professional Standards who will decide whether action should be taken under the *Discipline Ordinance 2006* rather than this policy.

2A. Allegations of conduct which breach a standard in *Faithfulness in Service* where the person by or on whose behalf the allegation is made has suffered harm or is at risk of harm must also be referred to the Director of Professional Standards.

3. Allegations of criminal conduct, including sexual abuse or child abuse, and allegations of professional misconduct cannot be dealt with under this policy. Any allegation which may involve such conduct must be referred directly to the Director of Professional Standards who will report such allegations to the police or relevant professional association, as appropriate.

4. Otherwise, allegations of unacceptable behaviour should be dealt with as close as possible to their source (unless the nature of the allegation or the identity of the person about whom the allegation is made requires otherwise).

5. Anonymous allegations or allegations made by a person who does not want to be identified cannot be dealt with under this policy.
6. Allegations of unacceptable behaviour should be treated seriously and sensitively. They should be dealt with promptly, having due regard to procedural fairness and confidentiality. Procedural fairness includes –
   • being informed of the allegations,
   • being provided with a reasonable opportunity to respond,
   • being treated without bias, and
   • being aware of progress in dealing with the allegation.

Confidentiality includes the way information or records relating to an allegation are stored and used.

7. No one making an allegation, or associated with an allegation or a person making an allegation, should be victimised.

8. Trivial, malicious or false allegations should not be made.

9. Both parties to an allegation should receive appropriate information, support and assistance in resolving the matter.

10. Where possible and appropriate, allegations should be dealt with by discussion, cooperation and conciliation consistent with biblical principles. Conciliation aims to reach a mutually acceptable outcome which is fair and effective. It also aims to minimise the potential for on-going damage to relationships, and to help the ministry of the parish to continue effectively.

11. Conciliation is intended to be a non-legal alternative for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour. It should only be used when both parties freely agree to conciliate, on the basis that –
   • legal representation is excluded, and
   • the matters discussed during the conciliation process are confidential.

12. At any meeting or interview during a conciliation process, both parties may be accompanied by a support person. A support person may speak at any meeting or interview, with the permission of the person they are supporting (unless the conciliator asks them not to, in order to facilitate the process).

13. To resolve a matter meaningfully, sometimes an act of reparation (such as an apology) is needed from the person about whom the allegation is made. Sometimes, in the course of resolving a matter, the person making an allegation may understand better why certain actions were taken and accept that the actions were not unacceptable behaviour even if they don’t agree with them.

14. It is not always appropriate to deal with an allegation by conciliation (for example, if an allegation is serious or the nature of the relationship between the parties makes conciliation inappropriate). If so, other options for dealing with the allegation appropriately must be considered.

**MODEL PROCEDURES**

The model procedures (and accompanying notes) for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour under this policy are set out in the Appendix.
Appendix – Model procedures for dealing with allegations of unacceptable behaviour
(The numbers in this flow diagram refer to the accompanying notes for these procedures)

Step 1 Direct Resolution

Does the allegation involve –
- sexual misconduct,
- misconduct involving a child,
- a breach of a standard in Faithfulness in Service where there is harm or a risk of harm,
- criminal conduct, or
- professional misconduct?

Yes

Can the matter be resolved directly with the person concerned? 1

Yes

End of process

No

Matter referred to Director of PSU to consider whether it should be dealt with under the Discipline Ordinance 2006, or reported to the police or a professional association (or dealt with in some other way).

End of process unless Director of PSU refers matter back to be dealt with under this policy

Step 2 Local Resolution

Is the allegation about the rector or a member of his family?

No

End of process

Yes

Refer the matter to the rector

Where appropriate, the rector is to seek to resolve the matter through an informal process of local conciliation having regard to the policy principles.

Does the rector consider there are reasons why it is appropriate not to start (or to end) a process of local conciliation? 2

No

End of local conciliation process 4

Yes

End of process 3

Step 3 Diocesan Resolution

Refer the matter to the Regional Bishop to review options for appropriately dealing with the matter. 5

Is it appropriate to start a process of diocesan conciliation to deal with the matter? 6

Yes

The Regional Bishop is to appoint a diocesan conciliator to undertake a process of diocesan conciliation in accordance with the policy. 7

Does the Regional Bishop consider there are reasons why it is appropriate to end the diocesan conciliation process? 6

No

Have the parties reached a mutually acceptable outcome which is fair and effective?

Yes

Regional Bishop may (again) review/pursue other options and end process

No

End of process

Pursue other options and end process 9

Yes

End of process 8

No

Have the parties reached a mutually acceptable outcome which is fair and effective?

Regional Bishop may (again) review/pursue other options and end process

End of process 8
Accompanying notes for model procedures

**Step 1 – Direct resolution**

1. A person making an allegation of unacceptable behaviour is encouraged to –
   
   (a) put their concerns in writing (in detail, and with examples of the behaviour),
   
   (b) try to resolve the matter directly with the person concerned, if appropriate, and
   
   (c) take a support person with them, if one-to-one contact is not appropriate.

**Step 2 – Local resolution**

2. This policy applies to allegations of unacceptable behaviour made against members of the clergy and church workers in parishes. This means that an allegation made against someone else in the parish should not be dealt with under this policy (although the principles in the policy may still be helpful).

   If, at any time, the rector considers that an allegation made against a member of clergy or church worker in the parish may involve –
   
   (a) sexual misconduct or misconduct involving children,
   
   (b) criminal conduct which should be reported to the police,
   
   (c) professional misconduct which should be reported to a professional association, or
   
   (d) a breach of a standard of *Faithfulness in Service* and the person by or on whose behalf the allegation is made has suffered harm or is at risk of harm,

   he must promptly refer the matter to the Director of Professional Standards, and suspend any further action under this policy.

   After receiving a referral from the rector, the Director should –
   
   (a) tell the rector promptly, and take the necessary action, if the Director considers that –
       
       (i) the matter should be dealt with under the *Discipline Ordinance 2006*,
       
       (ii) the matter should be reported to the police, or
       
       (iii) the matter should be reported to a professional association, or
       
       (iv) the matter should otherwise be dealt with,
       
       (in which case, the rector should end the process under this policy), or
   
   (b) if (a)(i) to (iv) do not apply, refer the matter back to the rector promptly, so the matter can continue to be dealt with under this policy.

3. Where the parties have reached a mutually acceptable outcome which is fair and effective, the rector should –
   
   (a) confirm with them that the conciliation process has finished, and
   
   (b) store a record of the allegation and the outcome in a confidential file in the parish offices.

4. If the rector does not start a conciliation process at the parish level, he should –
   
   (a) promptly tell the person making the allegation why, in writing,
   
   (b) tell the person that they can refer the matter to the Regional Bishop if they want to (within a month, if possible), and
   
   (c) store a record of the allegation and his correspondence with the person making the allegation in a confidential file in the parish offices.

   If the rector starts a local conciliation process but ends the process without a mutually acceptable outcome being reached between the parties, he should –
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(a) promptly tell both parties why, in writing,
(b) tell the person making the allegation that they can refer the matter to the Regional Bishop if they want to (within a month, if possible), and
(c) store a record of the allegation and his correspondence with both parties in a confidential file in the parish offices.

However, the rector should delay or modify such notice to either or both parties if –
(a) the matter is being dealt with under the Discipline Ordinance 2006 or is being reported to the police or a professional association, and
(b) the Director of Professional Standards requests that the rector delay or modify notice to the parties because of this.

Step 3 – Diocesan resolution

5. Where the person making an allegation refers the matter to a Regional Bishop, the Regional Bishop should –
(a) satisfy himself that the matter has been adequately considered under steps 1 and 2 above, and
(b) if so –
(i) explain the options for dealing with the matter to the person, and
(ii) facilitate the best way forward.

The options for dealing with the matter include one or more of the following:
(a) using a process of conciliation to achieve the purpose of this policy, that is –
(i) to encourage people in our parishes to deal with allegations of unacceptable behaviour in a wise and godly way, and
(ii) to encourage people to seek reconciliation, with repentance where needed,
(b) referring the allegation to the rector and parish wardens, to be dealt with as a work health and safety matter under Safe Work Australia bullying guidelines, if –
(i) the allegation concerns bullying towards a staff or volunteer worker in a parish, and
(ii) conciliation under this policy is not appropriate,
(c) referring the allegation to the Director of Professional Standards to be dealt with as a complaint under the Discipline Ordinance 2006, if the allegation is serious (noting that matters which may involve –
(i) sexual misconduct or misconduct involving a child,
(ii) a breach of a standard in Faithfulness in Service where the person by or on whose behalf the allegation is made has suffered harm or is at risk of harm,
(iii) criminal conduct which should be reported to the police, or
(iv) professional misconduct which should be reported to a professional association, must be referred to the Director of Professional Standards),
(d) dealing with the allegation under the Parish Relationships Ordinance 2001, if the allegation involves a serious breakdown in the pastoral relationship between the rector and a substantial number of parishioners,
(e) recommending that the person about whom the allegation is made have “guidance or specialised help” (as per Faithfulness in Service), and/or
(f) taking no further action under the policy if the matter is a dispute or disagreement, not an allegation of unacceptable behaviour (in which case, dispute resolution under the Parish Disputes Ordinance 1999 or the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 may be appropriate).

6. This policy applies to allegations of unacceptable behaviour made against members of the clergy and church workers in parishes. This means that an allegation made against someone else in a parish should not be dealt with under this policy (although the principles in the policy may still be helpful).

If, at any time, the Regional Bishop considers that an allegation made against a member of clergy or church worker in a parish may involve –
(a) sexual misconduct or misconduct involving children,
(b) criminal conduct which should be reported to the police,
(c) professional misconduct which should be reported to a professional association, or
(d) a breach of a standard of Faithfulness in Service and the person by or on whose behalf the allegation is made has suffered harm or is at risk of harm,
he must promptly refer the matter to the Director of Professional Standards, and suspend any further action under this policy.
After receiving a referral from a Regional Bishop, the Director should –

(a) tell the Regional Bishop promptly, and take the necessary action, if the Director considers that –
   (i) the matter should be dealt with under the Discipline Ordinance 2006,
   (ii) the matter should be reported to the police,
   (iii) the matter should be reported to a professional association, or
   (iv) the matter should otherwise be dealt with,
   (in which case, the Regional Bishop should end the process under this policy), or

(b) if (a)(i) to (iv) do not apply, refer the matter back to the Regional Bishop promptly, so the matter can continue to be dealt with under this policy.

There are other circumstances in which the Regional Bishop should not start conciliation at a diocesan level under this policy. If already started, he should end conciliation. These circumstances are if the Regional Bishop, having made due enquiry, considers –

(a) it is not appropriate to deal with the allegation this way, for example because of its seriousness or because of the nature of the relationship between the parties,
(b) there is no reasonable prospect of resolving the matter this way, for example because one party refuses to participate in a conciliation, or
(c) the allegation is trivial, malicious or false.

The Regional Bishop should also end a diocesan conciliation process if –

(a) the allegations have not been resolved between the parties within 3 months of a diocesan conciliator being appointed, and
(b) either party tells the Regional Bishop that they do not want to continue the process.

7. The diocesan conciliator should be –

(a) a person who –
   (i) is not a current or former parishioner of the parish concerned (in most cases),
   (ii) is competent in conflict resolution and conciliation, and
   (iii) agrees to conciliate the matter in accordance with the policy (as a condition of their appointment), or

(b) the Regional Bishop, if both parties and the Regional Bishop agree.

The Regional Bishop and the diocesan conciliator should be provided with any notification that the local conciliation process has not been started or has been ended by the rector (including the reason why).

The Regional Bishop or the diocesan conciliator may also require the person making the allegation to put the allegation in writing (with specific details and examples of the behaviour) if this has not already been done.

The diocesan conciliator should try to conciliate the matter, in accordance with the principles contained in the policy, within 3 months of being appointed.

8. Any mutually acceptable outcome reached between the parties should be fair and effective. It should be put in writing, signed and dated by each party, the diocesan conciliator and the Regional Bishop. The outcome should usually include the diocesan conciliator reviewing the situation at an agreed time or times after the outcome has been reached. A copy of the signed and dated outcome should be provided to both parties, the diocesan conciliator and the Regional Bishop.

Where the parties have reached a mutually acceptable outcome, the Regional Bishop should confirm with both parties that the diocesan conciliation process has finished. He should store a record of the allegation and a copy of the outcome in a confidential file in his office.

9. If the Regional Bishop does not start a diocesan conciliation process, he should –

(a) promptly notify the person making the allegation in writing why and that the process under the policy has ended,

(b) store a record of the allegation and his correspondence with the person making the allegation in a confidential file in his office, and

(c) pursue other options for dealing with the matter, if appropriate.

If the Regional Bishop starts a diocesan conciliation process but ends the process without a mutually acceptable outcome being reached between the parties, he should –
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(a) promptly notify both parties in writing why and that the process under the policy has ended,
(b) store a record of the allegation and his correspondence with both parties in a confidential file in his office, and
(c) pursue other options for dealing with the matter, if appropriate.

However, the Regional Bishop should delay or modify such notice to either or both parties if –
(a) the matter is being dealt with under the Discipline Ordinance 2006 or is being reported to the police or a professional association, and
(b) the Director of Professional Standards requests that the Regional Bishop delay or modify notice to the parties because of this.

I Certify that the Policy as printed is in accordance with the Policy as reported.

P COLGAN
Deputy Chair of Committees

I Certify that this Policy was passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 20 October 2015.

R WICKS
Secretary of Synod
Purpose of the bill

1. The purpose of the bill for the Authorisation of Lay Ministry Ordinance 2015 (the “bill”) is to provide for the authorisation of certain lay ministry in the Diocese in place of the Deaconesses, Readers and Other Lay Persons Ordinance 1981 (the “1981 ordinance”).

Recommendation

2. The Synod pass the bill as an ordinance of the Synod.

Background

3. In the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, following ancient practice, one senior minister, the bishop of the Diocese, is given the particular task of oversight of all the churches and ministries of the Diocese. This he shares with other ministers, expressed in particular by his power of licensing ministry in the churches of the Diocese.

4. Since the 1981 ordinance came into force there have been revolutionary changes in the way in which the ministry of the churches of the Diocese is conducted. In particular, as well as a significant shift away from authorised services, there has been the remarkable growth of lay ministry. The clergy/lay distinction is not as significant as it once was. There are now lay ministers in many church staff teams functioning effectively in the way in which ordained ministers, especially deacons, may have functioned in the past. And secondly, there has been a massive growth of informal and occasional lay ministry in the conduct of church services and in the various ministries of churches.

5. The 1981 ordinance does not adequately reflect this and is too complicated. A completely new ordinance is required.

Provisions of the bill

Authorisation of lay ministers by the Archbishop

6. The bill provides that the exercise of the office of lay minister or deaconess must be authorised by the Archbishop (clause 3(1)). A lay minister is a lay person appointed as a staff member to assist the rector undertake ministry in a church or parish, whether part-time or full-time or as an employee or volunteer (clause 2).

7. The requirement that the office of lay minister be authorised by the Archbishop is a natural extension of the principle that clergy must be licensed by the Archbishop to exercise the office of rector or assistant minister in a parish. In many churches, the distinction between ordained and non-ordained members of the staff team will rarely be significant. These publicly endorsed ministers of the church should have the proper authorisation and supervision which comes with an archbishop’s authority. This applies even if a person is a non-stipendiary member of a staff team. The question here is the person’s standing and responsibilities, not simply their form of remuneration.

8. The same principle applies to exercising the office of deaconess.

Lay ministry which may and must be authorised by the Archbishop

9. The bill provides that the Archbishop may authorise a number of lay ministries (clause 4(2)). These are –

- conduct services of public worship,
- administer baptisms,
- conduct funerals,
deliver sermons,
give expositions on the aims, functions and needs of an organisation,
perform pastoral duties.

10. Of these, an authority is only required where a lay person (including a lay minister or deaconess) wishes to deliver sermons on a regular basis, administer baptisms or conduct funerals (clause 3(2)).

11. In relation to the other lay ministries, it may be appropriate to issue an authority not because one is required but because local circumstances make an authority helpful for the person’s ministry. So, for example, although the formal category of Reader is diminishing, there is a role for something of the same function: that is, lay people who have particular authorisation for the conduct of public worship. Another example is an authority for those who have been designated as doing deputations, which is helpful to the person in gaining an entrance into churches for promoting their ministry.

Other lay ministry to be authorised by the rector

12. The bill contemplates that all other lay ministry should be conducted on the authority of the rector of the parish. This would include everything from Sunday school teachers to those delivering sermons on an occasional basis, those involved in pastoral work, musicians, those in missions and so forth.

Issuing of authorities

13. The bill preserves some of the provisions used in the 1981 ordinance for the issuing of authorities (clauses 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9(1)(a)).

14. In addition –

- Nothing in the bill affects the requirements in relation to the licensing of deaconesses by the Archbishop under the General Synod – Order of Deaconesses Canon 1969 Adopting Ordinance 1970 (clause 9(1)(b)). Such requirements are supplementary to any requirements under the bill that apply to deaconesses.
- The bill does not apply to lay persons who are licensed under the proposed Anglican School Ministry Ordinance 2015 (clause 9(2)). This avoids duplication of regulation of lay persons who are appointed as school chaplains, particularly in relation to their ministry in the school chapel which would be a “church” under the bill.

Transition and repeal

15. Although the bill repeals the 1981 ordinance (clause 10(2)), the existing authorities under the 1981 ordinance are preserved and are deemed to have been issued pursuant to the proposed ordinance (clause 10(1)).

16. The bill also recognises that there may currently be lay ministers who, upon the bill coming into effect, will not hold the requisite authority to exercise that office under clause 3(1) or to perform the ministries of that office under clause 3(2). In order to avoid potential contractual difficulties in requiring the requisite authorities to be obtained, the bill provides that lay ministers who are employees can continue to exercise the office of lay minister and undertake any of the ministries of that office until the end of their appointment. Other (non-employed) lay ministers can continue without the requisite authorities until 31 December 2016.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ROBERT WICKS
Diocesan Secretary

21 July 2015
Authorisation of Lay Ministry Ordinance 2015

No 35, 2015

Long Title
An Ordinance to provide for the authorisation of certain lay ministry in the Diocese and for related matters.

The Synod of the Diocese of Sydney Ordains as follows.

1. Name
This Ordinance is the Authorisation of Lay Ministry Ordinance 2015.

2. Interpretation
In this Ordinance –

“church” means –
(a) a building or part of a building duly consecrated or licensed for the celebration of divine service,
(b) an associated congregation of a church within the meaning of Schedule 1 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008, and
(c) a congregation of a parish within the meaning of Schedule 2 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008.

“deaconess” means a person who has been admitted to the order of Deaconess described in the General Synod – Order of Deaconesses Canon 1969 Adopting Ordinance 1970.

“lay minister” means a lay person appointed as a staff member to assist a minister undertake ministry in a parish or church, whether full-time or part-time or as an employee or volunteer.

“minister” means –
(a) in relation to a parish or a church of a parish, the rector of the parish,
(b) in relation to the Cathedral Church of St Andrew, the Dean, and
(c) in relation to a church which is not a church of a parish, the person licensed to officiate at the church.

“parish” means a parish or provisional parish recognised under the Parishes Ordinance 1979 or a recognised church or provisional recognised church under the Recognised Churches Ordinance 2000.

3. Authority required for certain lay ministry
(1) The minister of a church or parish must not permit a lay person to exercise the office of lay minister or deaconess in the church or parish unless the lay person has been authorised to do so pursuant to this Ordinance.

(2) The minister of a church must not permit a lay person (including a lay minister or deaconess) to –
(a) deliver sermons on a regular basis in the church,
(b) administer baptisms in the church, or
(c) conduct funerals in the church, unless the lay person has been authorised to do so pursuant to this Ordinance.

4. Authorisation of lay ministry
(1) The Archbishop may, by authority issued to a lay person, authorise the lay person to exercise the office of lay minister or deaconess in any church or parish.

(2) The Archbishop may authorise a lay person (including a lay minister or deaconess) –
(a) to undertake, at the request of the minister, one or more of the following ministries in any church –
(i) conduct services of public worship,
(ii) administer baptisms,
(iii) conduct funerals,
(iv) deliver sermons, and
(v) give expositions on the aims, functions and needs of an organisation, and
(b) to perform, under the oversight of the minister, pastoral duties in any parish, as specified in an authority issued to the lay person.
5. Authority may be limited
An authority issued pursuant to this Ordinance –
(a) may be limited to a church or to the churches named in the authority or to the parish or parishes named in the authority or may apply to the whole of the Diocese or to any part of the Diocese specified in the authority, and
(b) may be issued subject to any conditions which are specified in the authority.

6. Authority may be revoked
An authority issued pursuant to this Ordinance may be revoked at any time by the Archbishop.

7. Exercise of certain functions by an Assistant Bishop
The functions under clauses 4 and 5 may be exercised by an Assistant Bishop on behalf of the Archbishop.

8. Regulations
The Archbishop-in-Council may make regulations from time to time concerning –
(a) the qualifications which a person must possess and the conditions which a person must satisfy before an authority may be issued to that person pursuant to this Ordinance, or
(b) the manner in which any authority issued pursuant to this Ordinance is to be given and exercised.

9. Other authorities and requirements
(1) Nothing in this Ordinance affects any –
(a) authority issued pursuant to the General Synod – Lay Assistants at Holy Communion Canon 1973 Adopting Ordinance 1973, or
(b) requirement in relation to the licensing of deaconesses under the General Synod – Order of Deaconesses Canon 1969 Adopting Ordinance 1970.

(2) This Ordinance does not apply to the ministry exercised by a lay person as a Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain of a school.

10. Transition and repeal
(1) A lay person who, immediately before the commencement of this Ordinance, holds an authority issued under the Deaconesses, Readers and Other Lay Persons Ordinance 1981 continues to hold that authority subject to the terms and conditions on which it was issued and may continue to do any of the things which the person has been authorised to do in that authority. Such an authority is taken to have been issued pursuant to this Ordinance.

(2) Subject to subclause (1), the Deaconesses, Readers and Other Lay Persons Ordinance 1981 is repealed.

(3) A lay minister who, immediately before the commencement of this Ordinance, does not hold an authority required by this Ordinance under the Deaconesses, Readers and Other Lay Persons Ordinance 1981 to exercise the office of lay minister or undertake any of the ministries of that office, may continue to exercise such office and undertake such ministries without an authority under this Ordinance until –
(a) in the case of a lay minister appointed as an employee, the end of his or her appointment, and
(b) in any other case, 31 December 2016.

(4) A reference in an ordinance (other than this Ordinance) to the Deaconesses, Readers and Other Lay Persons Ordinance 1981 or any provision of that ordinance is taken to be a reference to the Authorisation of Lay Ministry Ordinance 2015 or the corresponding provision of that ordinance as applicable.

(5) Schedule 1 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 is amended by omitting rule 5.3(c) and inserting instead –
"(c) in the case of a lay person, he or she –
(i) has been requested to do so by or on behalf of the minister, and
(ii) holds a relevant authority issued pursuant to the Authorisation of Lay Ministry Ordinance 2015 if required."
I certify that the Ordinance as printed is in accordance with the Ordinance as reported.

R TONG
Chair of Committees

I certify that this Ordinance was passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 19 October 2015.

R WICKS
Secretary of Synod

I assent to this Ordinance.

GN DAVIES
Archbishop of Sydney
21/10/2015
General Synod – Constitution Amendment (Diocesan Council) Canon 2010 Assenting Ordinance 2015

Explanatory Statement

**Key points**
- The bill enables the Synod to assent to a new constitutional definition of “Diocesan Council”.
- The new definition will facilitate the passing of General Synod canons by circulation to dioceses.

**Purpose of the bill**
1. The purpose of the bill is to enable the Synod to assent to a Canon of the General Synod which amends the definition of “Diocesan Council” in the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia (the “Constitution”).

**Recommendation**
2. Synod pass the bill as an ordinance.

**Background**
3. The *Constitution Amendment (Diocesan Council) Canon 2010* proposes the insertion of a new definition of “Diocesan council” in the Constitution allowing the synod of a diocese to determine its diocesan council where there is no body able to exercise its powers and functions on its behalf when it is not in session.

4. The current Constitution contains the following definition of “Diocesan council” in section 74(1) – ‘“Diocesan council” in a Diocese where there is a synod means the body exercising the powers and functions of the synod on its behalf when it is not in session.’

5. This definition does not accurately describe the councils of all dioceses since a number of dioceses do not have a body that exercises the powers and functions of the synod on its behalf when it is not in session.

6. Under section 28A of the Constitution, the General Synod Standing Committee is able to initiate the passing of a canon by circulation to diocesan synods, and in turn allows a diocesan council to provide the assent in the place of the synod. However, because the existing definition of Diocesan Council in section 74 does not describe the councils of all dioceses, some dioceses are excluded from using this. It is therefore desirable to amend the definition in the Constitution so that it is capable of covering all diocesan councils.

7. The amendment to the definition will come into force if at least three quarters of diocesan synods, including all of the metropolitan sees, have assented to the amendment canon by ordinance.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ROBERT WICKS
*Diocesan Secretary*

17 August 2015
General Synod – Constitution Amendment (Diocesan Council) Canon 2010 Assenting Ordinance 2015

No 33, 2015

Long Title

An Ordinance to assent to Canon No 01, 2010 of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia.

The Synod of the Diocese of Sydney Ordains as follows.

1. Name of Ordinance

This Ordinance is the General Synod – Constitution Amendment (Diocesan Council) Canon 2010 Assenting Ordinance 2015.

2. Assent to Canon No 01, 2010

The Synod assents to Canon No 01, 2010 of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia, the text of which is set out in the Schedule.

Schedule

The General Synod prescribes as follows:

Title

1. This Canon is the Constitution Amendment (Diocesan Council) Canon 2010.

2. The definition of “Diocesan council” in subsection 74(1) of the Constitution is deleted and the following definition is inserted instead –

   “Diocesan council’ in a diocese where there is a synod means –

   (a) the body exercising powers and functions of the synod on its behalf when it is not in session, or

   (b) where there is no such body, the body declared by the relevant synod to be the diocesan council.”

I Certify that the Ordinance as printed is in accordance with the Ordinance as reported.

K SOWADA
Deputy Chair of Committees

I Certify that this Ordinance was passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 14 October 2015.

R WICKS
Secretary of Synod

I Assent to this Ordinance.

GN DAVIES
Archbishop of Sydney
15/10/2015
Retirements Ordinance 1993 Amendment Ordinance 2015

Explanatory Report

Key points

- The bill will require that the terms of any licence issued to a minister who has reached the retirement age be such that, after giving an opportunity to show cause, it may be revoked upon not less than 30 days notice being given to the minister.
- The amendment addresses a potential constitutional deficiency in the drafting of the existing provision.

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to explain the amendments in the bill for the Retirements Ordinance 1993 Amendment Ordinance 2015.

Recommendation

2. The Synod pass the Bill as an ordinance of the Synod.

Explanation of the Bill

3. The Retirements Ordinance 1993 (the “Principal Ordinance”) stipulates a retirement age for parochial ministers and other senior clergy (“Ministers”). In most cases the retirement age is the age that the Minister must reach in order to qualify for the aged pension under the Social Security Act 1947 (Cth). The Principal Ordinance contains procedures for the retirement age of a Minister to be extended to an age that is not beyond 70 years.

The revocation of licences of Ministers who have reached the retirement age

4. A Minister who has reached the retirement age may still be licensed to a position in the Diocese. However clause 8(2) of the Principal Ordinance requires that any such licence issued by the Archbishop must include terms which allow it to be revoked at any time.

5. There is a concern that clause 8(2) of the Principal Ordinance may not be consistent with section 3(4) of the Schedule of the Anglican Church of Australian Constitution Act 1902 which provides that –

The Synod of each Diocese shall have power to determine by ordinance in what cases the licence of a member of clergy licensed by the Bishop of the Diocese may be suspended or revoked. Any such licence may be suspended or revoked by the Bishop of the Diocese at the request of the member of the clergy, or (after opportunity given to that member of the clergy to show cause) in such of the said cases as the Synod shall by ordinance determine, save as aforesaid, the licence shall not be suspended or revoked, except as a consequence of a judgment or finding of the tribunal or of some other court of competent jurisdiction.

6. This part of the constitution was considered in the case of Baker v Gough [1963] NSWR 1345. The guiding principle from Baker v Gough is that the ordinance must specify the circumstances in which a licence can be revoked and provide that the revocation is to take place after giving the Minister the opportunity to show cause.

7. It is proposed that clause 8(2) of the Principal Ordinance be amended to require that the terms of any licence issued to a Minister who has reached the retirement age be such that, after giving an opportunity to show cause, it may be revoked upon not less than 30 days notice being given to the Minister. The expiry of the period of notice constitutes the circumstance in which the licence can be revoked.

8. The proposed amendment to clause 3(2)(b) is consequential since there will be no licences that are revocable by the Archbishop “at any time”.

Use of the title “canon emeritus”

9. It is proposed to delete clause 8(1) of the Principal Ordinance. Clause 8(1) provides that –

A clerical canon, upon retiring, is to be given the title of “canon emeritus”.

10. This is inconsistent with clause 1 of the Canon Emeritus Ordinance 1944, which provides –
The Archbishop is hereby authorised at his discretion from time to time to nominate and appoint Clerical Canons to the title and status of a Canon Emeritus upon such Canon respectively ceasing to be member of the Cathedral Chapter by resignation.

11. A question has also arisen as to whether a resignation from the Cathedral Chapter may be construed as a retirement from the chapter. The deletion of clause 8(1) will mean that the title is only conferred at the nomination and appointment of the Archbishop.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee

ROBERT WICKS
Diocesan Secretary

15 September 2015
Retirements Ordinance 1993 Amendment Ordinance 2015

No 32, 2015

Long Title
An Ordinance to amend the Retirements Ordinance 1993 with respect to the revocation of the licences of clergy who have reached the retirement age.

The Synod of the Diocese of Sydney Ordains as follows.

1. Name
This Ordinance is the Retirements Ordinance 1993 Amendment Ordinance 2015.

2. Amendment
The Retirements Ordinance 1993 is amended as follows –

(a) delete the words "which, under its terms, is not revocable by the Archbishop at any time" in clause 3(2)(b),

(b) delete clause 8(1) (and renumber clause 8(2) as 8), and

(c) delete all of the matter in renumbered clause 8 and insert instead the matter –

“A Minister who has reached the Retirement Age may be licensed to such position in the Diocese as the Archbishop may determine provided that the terms of the licence are such that, after giving the Minister opportunity to show cause, it may be revoked upon not less than 30 days notice being given to the Minister.”

I Certify that the Ordinance as printed is in accordance with the Ordinance as reported.

R TONG
Chair of Committees

I Certify that this Ordinance was passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 13 October 2015.

R WICKS
Secretary of Synod

I Assent to this Ordinance.

GN DAVIES
Archbishop of Sydney
19/10/2015
Synod and Standing Committee (Membership) Amendment Ordinance 2015

Explanatory Report

**Key points**
- A record of the declaration made by each lay Synod member of communicant membership of the Anglican Church of Australia is proposed to be retained and certified by the person who or body which elects or appoints the member rather than the signed declaration being delivered to the President.
- The definition of “Qualified Minister” for the purposes of being eligible for appointment as a Nominated Minister under Part 7 or as a clerical Nominated Indigenous Representative under Part 8A is proposed to be simplified to be a minister who is authorised or licensed to officiate by the Archbishop.
- The Archdeacon for Women’s Ministry is proposed to be a full voting member of the Standing Committee.

**Purpose of the bill**
1. The purpose of the bill for the Synod and Standing Committee (Membership) Amendment Ordinance 2015 (the “bill”) is to improve the administration of the Synod’s lay membership and the make changes to the qualifications and entitlements of certain members of the Synod and Standing Committee.

**Recommendation**
2. That the Synod pass the bill as an ordinance.

**Lay declarations of communicant membership**
3. Under clause 6 of the Synod Membership Ordinance 1995 (the “principal ordinance”), declarations of communicant membership of the Anglican Church of Australia are required to be made by lay members for each Synod. Clause 6 provides –

   **‘Declaration**

   Each Parochial Representative, alternate for a Parochial Representative, Nominated Layperson and lay Nominated Indigenous Representative must, before taking part in or voting at any session of the Synod, sign and deliver to the President the following declaration –

   "I, the undersigned A.B., do declare that I am a communicant member of the Anglican Church of Australia and not a member of any other Church.”

4. Such declarations must be signed and physically delivered to the President. In practice the Registry collects and retains the declarations on behalf of the President in conjunction with receiving notices that Synod members have been elected or appointed.

5. In 2013, the Synod amended the principal ordinance by requiring that lay members consent to their personal information being collected, used and disclosed for the purposes of the Diocese and Synod (clause 5A(1)). Under these provisions the person who or body which elects or appoints the member is required to retain a written copy of the consent and certify in the notice given to the Registrar of the election or appointment that such consent has been given (clause 5A(2)). The amendments also included provisions to enable any notice of the election or appointment of a Synod member to be given to the Register through a secure on-line database (clause 6C).

6. In order to improve the administration of the Synod’s lay membership, the bill proposes that the person who or body which elects or appoints a lay member of the Synod should also retain a signed copy of the declaration made by the member under clause 6 and certify in the notice of election or appointment given to the Registrar that the declaration has been made and that a signed copy has been retained.

7. Such a change will remove the need for a signed copy to be physically delivered to the President and enable all information concerning the election or appointment of lay members of the Synod to be provided to the Registrar through the secure on-line database.
Synod and Standing Committee (Membership) Amendment Ordinance 2015

Qualified Ministers

8. The Dictionary in the principal ordinance states –

“Qualified Minister” means a Minister who is authorised or licensed to officiate by the Archbishop and –

(a) has previously been summoned to a session of a Synod as a Parochial Minister; or
(b) is engaged in teaching or ministry within the Diocese on a full-time basis under the direction of the Archbishop or of a committee or corporation whose members are elected or appointed by the Synod or the Standing Committee.

9. The definition of Qualified Minister is relevant for determining those clergy who are eligible to be appointed to the Synod as Nominated Ministers under Part 7 of the principal ordinance or Nominated Indigenous Representatives under Part 8A.

10. The current definition of Qualified Minister has caused problems when a member of the clergy changes role and is therefore no longer eligible to be a member of Synod. Similarly there are examples of clergy who are not eligible to be a member of Synod even though they are able to make a worthwhile contribution to Synod. This includes female deacons who, for one reason or another, do not occupy a full-time position.

11. Similarly there are questions about the interpretation of the way in which a minister may be “under the direction of the Archbishop”. There are differences of opinion about whether an Assistant Minister in a parish is “under the direction of the Archbishop”.

12. Further, there are questions about whether a member of clergy is eligible to be a member of Synod under Part 7 if they work “under the direction of . . . a committee or corporation whose members are elected or appointed by the Synod or the Standing Committee” where only some of the members are “elected or appointed by the Synod or the Standing Committee”.

13. To resolve these difficulties the bill proposes that the definition of “Qualified Minister” be changed to simply be “a Minister who is authorised or licensed to officiate by the Archbishop”.

Updating of terminology

14. The bill also updates the terminology and definitions used in the principal ordinance largely as a result of changes in terminology in relation to parochial units introduced by the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008. Also, the revised definition for “General Meeting” and the new definition for “Wardens” accommodate the particular arrangements that apply for the Cathedral.

Standing Committee membership

15. In the past there were multiple Archdeacons, usually one for each region, but the only current Archdeacon is the Archdeacon for Women’s Ministry. The Standing Committee Ordinance 1897 was changed some years ago to provide that the Archdeacons should continue to attend Standing Committee but not have the right to vote. Given there is now only one Archdeacon and that she has special responsibilities in the Diocese, it is recommended that the Archdeacon for Women’s Ministry be granted full membership of Standing Committee including the right to vote. The bill includes the relevant amendment to the Standing Committee Ordinance 1897.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

DOUG MARR
Registrar

15 September 2015
Synod and Standing Committee (Membership) Amendment Ordinance 2015

No 34, 2015

Long Title
An Ordinance to improve the administration of the Synod’s lay membership and to make changes to the qualifications and entitlements of certain members of the Synod and Standing Committee.

The Synod of the Diocese of Sydney Ordains as follows.

1. Name
This Ordinance is the Synod and Standing Committee (Membership) Amendment Ordinance 2015.

2. Amendment of the Synod Membership Ordinance 1995
The Synod Membership Ordinance 1995 is amended as follows –

(a) renumber clause 6 as clause 6(1) and –

(i) in the renumbered clause 6(1) omit the matter “, before taking part in or voting at any session of the Synod, sign and deliver to the President the following declaration” and insert instead the following –

“sign the following declaration prior to notice of his or her election or appointment being given under this Ordinance to the Registrar”, and

(ii) insert a new clause 6(2) as follows –

“(2) The person or body which is required to give the Registrar notice of an election or appointment referred to in subclause (1) must retain, or cause to be retained, the signed declaration.”, and

(b) omit each reference to “Vestry Meeting” and insert instead “General Meeting”, and

(c) omit the matter “of clause 14 of the Church Administration Ordinance 1990” in clause 16 and insert instead the following –

“which apply to the nomination of persons and the conduct of contested elections at a General Meeting “, and

(d) insert a new clause 17(e) as follows –

“(e) certifying that the person has signed the declaration required by clause 6(1) and that the signed declaration has been retained.”, and

(e) in clauses 18 and 19 omit the matter “churchwardens of the church of the Parochial Unit or if there is more than one church in the Parochial Unit, to the churchwardens of the principal church” and insert instead the word “Wardens”, and

(f) insert a new clause 22A(2)(f) as follows –

“(f) certifying that the Qualified Person appointed as the alternate has signed the declaration required by clause 6(1) and that the signed declaration has been retained.”, and

(g) insert a new clause 45(e) as follows –

“(e) certifying that the person elected to be a Nominated Lay Person had signed the declaration required by clause 6(1) and that the signed declaration has been retained.”, and

(h) omit all the words after “clause 5A” in clause 50C(d) and insert instead the following –

“and that the person has signed the declaration required by clause 6(1), and that a written record of the consent and the signed declaration have been retained”, and

(i) omit the definitions of “Parish”, “Parochial Minister” and “Provisional Parish” in the Dictionary and insert instead the following –

“Parish” means a parish constituted under or recognised as such under the Parishes Ordinance 1979 or a recognised church under the Recognised Churches Ordinance 2000.

“Parochial Minister” means a Minister who is licensed as the rector or acting rector of a Parochial Unit.
“Provisional Parish” means a provisional parish constituted under or recognised as such under the Parishes Ordinance 1979 or a provisional recognised church under the Recognised Churches Ordinance 2000.’, and

(j) in the definition of “Qualified Minister” in the Dictionary omit all the matter after the first occurrence of “Archbishop”, and

(k) omit the definition of “Vestry Meeting” in the Dictionary and insert instead the following –

“General Meeting” means –

(a) in relation to a Parochial Unit having only one church to which the rules in Schedule 1 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 apply – a general meeting of the parishioners of the church of the Parochial Unit, and

(b) in relation to a Parochial Unit having more than one church to which the rules in Schedule 1 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 apply or in relation to a Parochial Unit to which the rules in Schedule 2 of that ordinance apply – a general meeting of the parishioners of the Parochial Unit, and

(c) in relation to St Andrew’s Cathedral – the Annual Meeting of the Cathedral Congregations under the Cathedral Ordinance 1969.’, and

(l) insert a new definition in the Dictionary as follows –

“Wardens” means –

(a) in relation to a Parochial Unit to which the rules in Schedule 1 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 apply – the wardens of the principal or only church of the Parochial Unit, and

(b) in relation to a Parochial Unit to which the rules in Schedule 2 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 apply – the wardens of the Parochial Unit, and

(c) in relation to St Andrew’s Cathedral – the Cathedral Chapter.

3. Amendment of the Standing Committee Ordinance 1897

The Standing Committee Ordinance 1897 is amended as follows –

(a) insert the matter “the Archdeacon for Women’s Ministry,” in clause 1A(1)(a) after the matter “the Regional Bishops,”, and

(b) omit clause 1A(1)(f) and insert instead the following –

“(f) The Regional Archdeacons.”, and

(c) omit the words “An Archdeacon” in clause 1A(2) and insert instead the words “A Regional Archdeacon”.

4. Commencement

Clauses 2 and 3 commence on the day immediately following the last day of the 2nd session of the 50th Synod.

I Certify that the Ordinance as printed is in accordance with the Ordinance as reported.

K SOWADA
Deputy Chair of Committees

I Certify that this Ordinance was passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 14 October 2015.

R WICKS
Secretary of Synod

I Assent to this Ordinance.

GN DAVIES
Archbishop of Sydney
19/10/2015
Synod Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance 2015
Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2015
Explanatory Report

Key points

- The total funds available to Synod will increase by 8% in 2016 and then plateau as increasing distributions from GAB are offset by an expected reduction in funds from parish trust ordinances.
- New allocations of Synod funds are required to replenish the Synod Risk Reserve ($288k-$300k) and as a Diocesan contribution to the recurrent funding needs of the Cathedral ($238k-$250k). This means that Synod funding for most other recipients over the triennium is the same or similar to 2015.
- Parochial network costs are expected to rise in 2016 due to increases in parish property and liability insurance, Professional Standards Unit, and Safe Ministry Training costs. This will require an increase in the variable PCR charge from 4.9% to 5.2%.
- Fixed Ministry Costs (for clergy licensed to the parish) are expected to increase by nearly 6% pa due to the expected annual increases in stipends and a significant increase in the cost of stipend continuance insurance.
- The Church Land Acquisition Levy continues at 2% each year.

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to provide explanatory comments on the specific proposed sources and uses of Synod funds. The report should be read in conjunction with the broader explanations provided in the Statement of Funding Principles and Priorities 2016 – 2018 (the “Statement”).

Recommendation

2. The Synod pass the two bills as ordinances of the Synod.

Background

3. Under the Synod Estimates Ordinance 1998 the Standing Committee is required to prepare for the second ordinary session of the 50th Synod a proposed ordinance reflecting the Statement which contains Synod funding estimates for 2016-2018.

4. The Synod Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance 2015 and the Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2015 (the “Ordinances”) have been prepared to give effect to the Statement.

5. The details of specific appropriations of individual Synod and parish trust funds and the amounts allocated to particular purposes and organisations under the Synod Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance 2015 are shown in Attachment 1 to this report.

6. The details of the cost recoveries charge in respect of ministry costs and parochial network costs and the levy to acquire land for future church sites under the Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2015 are shown in Attachment 2 to this report. The estimate of the amount of the variable parochial cost recoveries charge and the church land acquisitions levy to be paid by each parochial unit are shown in Attachment 3 to this report.

Source of funds

7. The Glebe Administration Board (the “GAB”) has advised the Standing Committee that the amount which may prudently be distributed from the Diocesan Endowment for spending by the Synod in 2016 is $4,300,000. The GAB has also indicated that it proposes distributions of $4,300,000 increased by CPI, estimated at 2.5% pa, in each of 2017 and 2018, subject to any significant adverse market movements.

8. The amount of Synod’s share of the distribution received under each of the 7 parish trust ordinances that provide for a portion of the income to be distributed to Synod is detailed in the Schedule in Attachment 1. In aggregate, Synod’s share of the income derived from these ordinances will be $1,179,000 in 2016.
9. Beyond 2016 however the picture is much less clear. It is possible that the amount of this income will decline significantly in 2017 and 2018. It is already known that there will be no such income flowing to Synod in 2018 from Manly because the ordinance passed by Standing Committee in 2013 provides for 100% of the lease income earned in 2016 and 2017 to be retained by the parish to help fund a proposed future redevelopment of their rental properties. Synod’s share of the distribution of property income from St James King St, Church Hill and Wollongong in 2017 and 2018 will be dependent on the terms of the new ordinances due to be passed by Standing Committee later this year, as the authority to distribute income under the first two of these present ordinances expires in 2015, and Wollongong in 2016.

10. Given the uncertainties surrounding the magnitude of the Synod’s future share of any distribution from parish trust ordinances, the estimates for 2017 and 2018 in the Schedule in Attachment 1 have been prepared on the basis that there will be no amount distributed from Manly in 2016 (available for Synod in 2018) and all other parish distributions will be equal to the actual amount received in 2014 (available for Synod in 2016). However, since these assumptions would mean the total parish trust income will be $245,000 less in 2018 than in 2017 it was considered prudent to set aside $100,000 of the income otherwise available to be applied in 2017 and not apply that amount until 2018.

11. In accordance with the established formula, in each year one percent of the total income available to Synod is appropriated and added to the capital of the Sydney Anglican Indigenous Peoples Ministry Fund, with the amount shown as a direct deduction from the Sources of funds.

12. The aggregate of all sources of funds available to Synod in 2016 will be $5,439,000, which represents an increase of $419,000 or 8.3% compared with 2015. A small increase is expected in 2017, followed by a slight decrease in 2018.

13. The aggregate of the estimated amount required as a parish contribution to the cost of Diocesan archives and the parish property and liability insurance program and the other parochial network costs results in a total amount of $5,083,000 to be recovered from parishes in the form of the variable parochial cost recovery charge for 2016. The estimate of the amounts to be recovered for 2017 and 2018 is $5,309,000 and $5,536,000 respectively.

14. A parish levy of 2% of net operating receipts will be raised in each of the years 2016-2018 to provide the funds needed by the Mission Property Fund to continue to acquire land for new church sites in the greenfield areas of the Diocese. It is expected the proceeds of this levy will be approximately $2,020,000 in 2016 rising to $2,081,000 and then $2,143,000 in the later years.

Use of funds

Long term requirements

15. The role undertaken by the Archbishop’s Public Relations (Media Officer) is considered an essential element of the Diocesan ministry network. Therefore, while such a person is employed by the Anglican Media Council, an allocation from Synod Funds will be paid to the Council to be applied for this specific purpose. The amount of this allocation in 2016 ($150,000), and the estimate of the amounts for 2017 and 2018, remain unchanged from the 2015 allocation as the role is considered essential.

16. As in previous years, one of the requirements of our ministry network is that we maintain an archive record of parish material. In 2014 the amount of the allocation was increased to $68,000 representing approximately 50% of the overall cost of the archive function. The amount of this allocation in 2016, and the estimate for 2017 and 2018, remains unchanged from the 2015 allocation as the role is considered essential.

Immediate requirements

17. For the 2016-2018 triennium our estimated membership and affiliation costs in the wider Anglican Church are to be funded through an allocation of Synod funds. In 2015 these costs covered the assessment raised by the General Synod, the accommodation and travel costs of Sydney representatives attending the General Synod, the costs of the Provincial Synod, and the affiliation fee with Freedom4Faith. For 2016-2018 we have added our membership of the NSW Council of Churches to this list, as for the last few years this has been paid from Synod Contingencies. The estimate of the General Synod assessment in 2016 and 2017 and 2018 is based on the amount of their invoice for 2015 plus CPI of 2% pa. Generally the amount of the allocation in 2016, and the estimate for 2017 and 2018, of the other elements of our membership and affiliation costs in the wider Anglican Church remain unchanged from the 2015 allocation, although some allow for CPI of 2% pa over that period.

18. The estimate of the amount of Synod funding required to support the Diocese’s participation in the National Church Life Survey appears in this section for 2016-2018 in view of the key role specific NCLS data now has in helping us measure progress in Mission 2020. For 2016 the amount is based on the estimated cost of Diocesan participation in a special ‘Sydney Anglican’ NCLS in 2016 ($133,000 less the
anticipated parish contribution of $35,000 and the Synod funding already provided in 2015 of $50,000). There should be no cost of NCLS in 2017 and then an amount of $15,000 will be required in 2018 to cover the cost of the preliminary work for the next major NCLS in 2019.

19. The direct external costs of each ordinary session of Synod, such as venue hire and printing costs, are again funded through an allocation of Synod funds with the amount based on the actual cost for 2015. The estimated cost for 2017 and 2018 assumes a continuation of the traditional venue (Wesley Theatre), format (afternoon and evening sessions) and duration (5 days) of the Synod.

20. The cost of Standing Committee (and subcommittee) members’ car parking in St Andrew’s House is considered an appropriate use of Synod funds. The amount of this allocation in 2016, and the estimates for 2017 and 2018, remain unchanged from the 2015 allocation.

21. The allocation of Synod funds in 2016, and the estimates for 2017 and 2018, to cover the costs incurred by the Secretariat in providing the agreed services to the Synod, Standing Committee and parishes under its ordinance are based on the 2015 allocation plus CPI of 2% pa.

22. The parochial network costs (recovered through the variable portion of the parochial cost recoveries charge) consist of the estimated cost of or parish-related contribution to –

(a) The annual parish property and liability insurance program – at its meeting on 27 February 2015 the Board of the Property Trust approved the following forecast of insurance costs for the parish insurance component of the variable PCR charge, based on advice from their insurance broker –

2016 = $3,700,000 (an increase of 5.7%)
2017 = $3,900,000 (an increase of 5.4%)
2018 = $4,100,000 (an increase of 5.1%)

(b) The parish risk management program – based on 2015 actual plus CPI of 2% pa,

(c) Parish related work by the Professional Standards Unit (PSU) – the work of the PSU has increased very considerably as a result of the heightened awareness and publicity generated by the Royal Commission into Institutional Child Sexual Abuse. As a result the PSU’s actual costs for 2015 and forecast costs for 2016-2018 are substantially higher than the amount being recovered from parishes through the variable PCR charge for 2015. Standing Committee has agreed that the unexpected increase in the non-standard expenses of the PSU in late 2014 and 2015 should be paid initially from Synod Fund 131, with that fund then replenished through a corresponding increase in the PSU’s component of the variable PCR charge in 2016. Standing Committee has also agreed that from 1 January 2016 the full cost of the parish related work of the PSU should be funded through the variable component of the PCR charge. [see paragraphs 22, 23 and 24 below]

(d) The safe ministry training program (provided by Youthworks on behalf of the PSU) – the amount for 2016 has been increased to cover more of Youthworks’ staff, on-costs and program expenses associated with safe ministry training, plus CPI of 2% pa thereafter,

(e) A provision for relief and remission of cost recovery charges – based on the Finance Committee’s recommendation this has been reduced to $10,000 pa,

(f) Support for the Sydney Anglican Parish Accounting System (SAPAS) – based on the Finance Committee’s recommendation funding for this item has been discontinued although SDS will continue to provide some direct support and advice and where appropriate parishes can engage one of several consultants now operating with detailed experience in delivering parish accounting services, and

(g) The Secretariat’s administration and accounting fee, approved by the Finance Committee, for the PCR Fund 951 – based on 2015 actual plus CPI of 2% pa.

23. The Secretariat was directed to pay an amount of $10,811 from Synod Fund 131 for the unexpected increase in the non-standard expenses incurred by the PSU in late 2014 and then $44,398 for further such costs to March 2015. The PSU has estimated the amount of such non-standard expenses that will be incurred between April and December 2015, most of which relate to the cost of a Tribunal hearing, at up to $100,000. As a result the estimate of the total of such amounts, principally grants to and for victims paid from PSU funds, legal fees, investigation costs and Tribunals, for which Synod Fund 131 will need to be reimbursed through the PSU’s component of the variable PCR charge in 2016 is approximately $150,000.

24. In a report to Standing Committee in July 2015 the PSU identified the principal contributors to its increased work load as being –
(a) A comprehensive review of previous PSU files concerning child sexual abuse, many of which then required further work to ensure they had been adequately recorded, investigated and responded to, which required further time of the Director, Chaplain and Contact Persons.

(b) A spike in new claims and other contact from the survivors who have been engaged with or impacted by the Royal Commission. While any payments made under the Pastoral Care and Assistance Scheme are funded separately, the cost of the claimant’s initial counselling, independent legal advice, a review if one is sought, and any travel in connection with an Archbishop’s apology are borne by the PSU.

(c) Action to implement the recommendations coming from a review of the PSU’s child protection policies undertaken by Professor Parkinson to make the policies more coherent, clearly communicated and effective.

(d) Communication and auditing of parishes’ compliance with the new NSW government Working With Children Checks.

25. This increased workload has led to an unreasonable level of overtime, which given the sensitive and disturbing subject matter of sexual abuse cases increases the risk of vicarious trauma and burnout. Accordingly two new PSU positions were created in 2014 – a Safe Ministry Representative Liaison Officer (0.4) and a Manager, Legal Support (initially 0.6 but moving to F/T from 2016). The amount of funding recommended is based on the PSU’s report of costs for 2016, plus CPI of 2% pa thereafter.

26. The ministry costs to be recovered through the ‘fixed’ portion of the parochial cost recoveries charge consist of the contributions required on behalf of each of the ordained ministry staff licensed to the parochial unit in relation to –

(a) Superannuation – Standing Committee has determined the minimum stipend for 2016 will be $64,810, an increase of 4.0% over 2015. The superannuation contribution rate of 17% remains unchanged. The annual superannuation charge per minister for 2016 is therefore expected to increase by 4.0%. A further 4% increase in stipends has been assumed for 2017 and 2018, giving a corresponding increase in the superannuation charge in each of those years.

(b) Long service leave – The Anglican Church of Australia Long Service Leave Fund is not expected to advise the member contribution rate for 2016 until some time in the 4th quarter of 2015. It is expected the rate determined will need to take account of 2 factors – the increase in the National stipend (which we have assumed will be approximately 3%), and the continuing need, based on actuarial advice, to progressively increase the ‘buffer’ of assets over liabilities to maintain the historically conservative coverage to fund future member liabilities (for which we have assumed a further increase of approximately 5% will be required). Accordingly, after maintaining the existing level of LSL administration fee, an overall increase of approximately 8% has been assumed for each of the 3 years.

(c) Stipend continuance insurance – The premium rate for this insurance is fixed for 3 years, although the actual premium is recalculated each year in the light of the actual remuneration package (minimum stipend plus recommended benefits/allowances). The current 3 year term ends on 31 December 2016 and our broker’s advice is that we should expect substantial premium increases. Accordingly, while the amount of the premium rate increase to take effect from 2017 cannot be accurately predicted at this stage, Standing Committee considers it prudent to attempt to ‘smooth’ this increase by increasing the charge on parishes by at least 15% in 2016 and providing for a further 15% increase in 2017, before returning to a more normal 4% increase in 2018 based just on the expected increase in stipends for that year.

(d) Sickness and Accident Fund – This is a self-insured risk and the amounts paid out of the fund in recent years have sometimes exceeded the amount recovered through the PCR charge. While there is a sufficient reserve of funds held to cover known and anticipated claims, it is proposed that the 2016 charge for all Ministers should be increased by 25% and then maintained at that new rate for 2017 and 2018.

27. The actual amount of the ministry costs recovered through the ‘fixed’ portion of the parochial cost recoveries charge for 2016, and the estimates for 2017 and 2018, may need to be varied if the actual amount of any of the components of these ministry costs for any of these years differs materially from the estimates identified above when compiling this report for Synod.

28. Details of the estimated amount of each of the parochial network costs and the ministry costs are shown in Attachment 2.

29. Last year for the first time, Standing Committee allocated some $220,000 of Synod funds to replenish the Synod Fund 131. Standing Committee has agreed as a matter of policy that whenever the balance in
Synod Fund 131 at 30 June is below a particular amount either the Synod or the Standing Committee should pass an ordinance by 31 December that year to increase the amount in that fund to a certain level by 31 December the following year. This ordinance provides $288,000 to replenish Synod Fund 131 in 2016. While less than would be required by a strict application of the policy, Standing Committee considers this amount a reasonable compromise, given the number of other ‘Immediate requirements’ that require funding and the limited amount of total funds available to the Synod. An estimate of $300,000 for this item is included for both 2017 and 2018.

30. In 2013 Standing Committee appointed a working group to assess the sustainability of the Cathedral’s ministries and following that review, in July 2014 Standing Committee agreed in principle to make a Diocesan contribution of $250,000 per annum to the recurrent funding needs of the Cathedral from the funds of the Synod, commencing in 2016. In making that decision Standing Committee recognised the Diocesan nature of the Cathedral ministry and the implications that has for funding this ministry. Standing Committee also agreed to review any Diocesan funding arrangement after 3 years, and also asked for a further report in relation to the Cathedral’s long term property maintenance needs.

31. In part the decision to make a Diocesan contribution to the recurrent funding needs of the Cathedral recognises some of the historical context – prior to 1975 the Cathedral had been entitled to a share of the surplus earned from the property which now includes St Andrew’s House and the shopping arcade; for much of last century the Endowment of the See had provided the stipend and allowances (including housing) for the Dean; and for a number of the early years of this century the Synod provided various grants to the Cathedral Chapter to supplement its own income.

32. In March 2015 the Cathedral Chapter identified the payment of the Dean’s stipend, allowances and housing amounting to $160,000 and a further payment of $90,000 for the diocesan use of the Cathedral were essential to the sustainability of the Cathedral.

33. Given the limited amount of Synod funds available, Standing Committee has therefore recommended an allocation of $238,000 in 2016 and $250,000 in each of 2017 and 2018 as a Diocesan contribution to the recurrent funding needs of the Cathedral, primarily in the form of the Dean’s remuneration and housing cost and as a contribution to recurrent maintenance.

Long term mission commitments

34. Despite the modest increase in total funds available to Synod in 2016, the amount available for “Long term mission commitments” and “Current mission activities” is very similar to 2015 because there have been a couple of significant new “Immediate requirement” items added that require funding in 2016.

35. The amount allocated to support the work of Ministry, Training and Development has been increased by $27,000 compared to 2015, in order to cover the budgeted costs of the Department which has primary responsibility for recruiting, guiding and selecting for ministry in the Diocese, as well as providing continuing education for ministers.

36. The allocation of $40,000 to the Ordination Training Fund has been continued for 2016-2018. This is the estimated cost of undertaking psychological testing of all new ordinands, and arranging and delivering the new ordinands’ conference.

37. In 2013 the critical importance of acquiring land for future church sites in the expanding greenfield areas of the Diocese was recognised as a major long term Mission initiative. Standing Committee believes that initiative should be continued, and accordingly a further amount of approximately $2 million has been set aside each year of 2016-2018 for this purpose. The funds for this initiative will again be raised by way of a levy on all parochial units, but from 2016 onwards it is proposed this levy should be set at 2.0% of each parish’s net operating receipts, rather than back-calculated to raise $2 million, in order to offset the effects of inflation over time. While the amount raised each year will probably not be sufficient to purchase even one new church site, it is a significant contribution to this initiative and will go a long way toward enabling a permanent ministry presence to be established in new housing areas. All these funds will be directed towards greenfield areas because there is currently no permanent ministry presence in these areas, whereas in brownfield areas there is at least some existing church plant available to support ministry to the growing population in those areas. At the same time as the parish levy is providing money to purchase new church sites, the Archbishop has established a new Fundraising Unit to work on a multi-faceted campaign to raise the funds for the building work needed. A number of Diocesan organisations including the Department of Evangelism and New Churches, Moore Theological College, Youthworks College and Ministry Training and Development are working to identify, equip and nurture the church planters to lead these new churches.

38. Consideration was also given to providing funding for other new initiatives, in particular some form of seed funding for church planting ministries, but the tightness of the overall budget meant there were no funds available to support such initiatives.
39. The amount allocated to support the work of Moore Theological College has been maintained at substantially the same level as 2015. The College will continue to receive the majority of the funds allocated under long term mission commitments, reflecting the strategic long term importance of the College to the Mission of the Diocese.

40. Similarly, the amount allocated to support the work of Youthworks College has been maintained at the same level as 2015. Youthworks College continues to be recognised for its important role in providing future leadership for our churches and for the Mission.

Current mission activities

41. The amount of Synod funds allocated to support the work of the Anglican Education Commission in 2016, and the estimate for of the amounts for 2017 and 2018, have been maintained at the same level as in 2015. This is considered the minimum reasonable allocation commensurate with maintaining the Synod’s interest in the work of the Commission. As noted last year, the Anglican Education Commission already draws much of the income it needs directly from the Anglican Schools it supports, and apart from some previous seed funding, the provision of central funds is primarily directed to supporting the Commission’s role in advocacy.

42. The amount of the Synod allocation for the Anglican Media Council to provide internal communication and evangelism, including through their website and Southern Cross, in 2016, and the estimate of the amounts for 2017 and 2018, remain unchanged from the 2015 allocation. This level of funding is considered the minimum viable for the Council to maintain this work.

43. The Synod funding allocated in 2016, and the estimate of the amounts to be allocated for 2017 and 2018, for the research function provided by Anglicare have been increased in recognition that the amount allocated in 2015 significantly underfunded the cost of this work. The specific research provided, including that derived from the NCLS data, has proven integral to much of the planning for Mission 2020.

44. The amount allocated to support the work of the Department of Evangelism and New Churches over 2016-2018 has been maintained at the 2015 level. The Department provides resources which support local evangelism and directly assist the planting of new Sydney Anglican congregations as well as having responsibility for developing a Diocesan wide approach to ethnic, cross cultural and multicultural gospel ministry in the regions and parishes.

45. The amount of the allocation of Synod funds to support the work of the Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee ("TEMOC") in 2016, and the estimate of the amounts for 2017 and 2018, have been maintained at $100,000. The Standing Committee recognises the strategic importance of maintaining a clear Anglican presence amongst evangelical Christians ministering in the tertiary education sector, which is underpinned by the Archbishop’s role in licensing a number of the university chaplains. Although there are clearly many new opportunities in this area, in the end the critical nature of the other activities being supported with the limited funds available meant an increased allocation in response to Synod’s request “to consider modest additional funding for TAFE/CVET ministry grants” is not recommended.

46. The amount of the allocation of Synod funds to support gospel work outside the Diocese has been maintained at 4% of the total available funds in 2016, and of the estimates for 2017 and 2018. The Standing Committee recognises that Synod resolution 40/09 “encourages it to consider how in future the Diocese may return to 5% of income that would be made available for Gospel work beyond the Diocese”, however the limited funds available to Synod in 2016-2018 make any increased allocation at this time impractical.

47. The amount of the Synod allocation for Youthworks – Ministry Support Team in 2016, and the estimate of the amounts for 2017 and 2018, remain unchanged from the 2015 allocation. The Ministry Support Team in Youthworks provides training, advice and support for children’s and youth ministry and Special Religious Education.

48. In response to resolution 14/12 which called for the Standing Committee to address the need for sufficient funds to sustain high quality Special Religious Education ("SRE") within all Government primary schools within the Diocese, a new allocation of $100,000 in 2014 and $200,000 in 2015 was made to Youthworks to partially fund the upgrade of Primary SRE. These funds have been applied to assist in the formation of a new ‘SRE Office’ within Youthworks with a focus on the development of approved curriculum resources and an overview of the training and accreditation of the (largely volunteer) teachers. After considering a proposal for a further $125,000 pa to assist in the appointment of a full-time Director of Curriculum and a full-time Director of Quality Assurance, Standing Committee recommends the amount allocated to support the new SRE Office in 2016, and the estimate of the amounts for 2017 and 2018 be maintained at the level of $200,000 each year, and regrets that the SRE Office cannot be adequately financially supported by Synod funding at this time and understands that not all desired SRE Office positions can be established until adequate financial resources are found.
49. The amount of the allocation in 2016, and the estimates of the amounts for 2017 and 2018, to support the ministry on Lord Howe Island have been continued at the same level as in 2015.

50. As noted above, consideration was also given to providing funding for new initiatives such as the Social Issues Committee under the heading of Current mission activities. Notwithstanding the increasing number of matters of concern to the Synod that are being referred to the Social Issues Committee for further research, the tightness of the overall budget meant there were no funds available to support the work of this Committee.

51. An amount of $65,000 has been allocated to Contingencies to give the Standing Committee some flexibility and capacity to respond to changed circumstances in 2016, and a similar figure has been estimated for 2017 and 2018.

52. As indicated in the annexure to the Statement of Funding Principles and Priorities 2016-2018, organisations that seek Synod funds have been asked to provide –

(a) a detailed proposal identifying the purpose for which the funds are sought, attempts that have or can be made to raise funds from other sources, the likely timing of any expenditure, the outcomes expected, and the reporting and other accountability measures by which those outcomes will be assessed, and

(b) a statement of any reserves held by the organisation specifically for the purpose for which funds are being sought, or that could be made available for that purpose.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ROBERT WICKS
Diocesan Secretary

25 August 2015
## Synod Funding for 2016 - 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAB distribution from DE</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish trusts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James King St (Phillip Street office block)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Hill York St (investment income)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Hill York St (No. 1 York St office block)</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Matthew's Manly (shops on the Corso)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narellan (investment income from sale proceeds)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde (Kirkby Gardens residential unit block)</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sydney (investment income from sale proceeds)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong (hotel/university accommodation)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPT Synod Fund (C/F 400 interest less ACPT fees)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less 1% added to capital of SAIPMF</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less/add provision to part compensate loss of Manly income in 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Cost Recovery (variable charge)</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>5,233</td>
<td>5,309</td>
<td>5,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Land Acquisitions &amp; Church Planting Levy</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>5,439</td>
<td>5,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parish Net Operating Receipts (estimate for 2014 applicable to 2016, then 3% pa increase)

- 95.483 (million)
- 101.222 (million)
- 104.259 (million)
- 107.386 (million)

Variable PCR charge (average of all parochial units)

- 4.87%
- 5.17%
- 5.09%
- 5.15%

Church land acquisition levy

- 2.09%
- 2.00%
- 2.00%
- 2.00%
### Synod Funding for 2016-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual for 2015</th>
<th>Proposed for 2016</th>
<th>Estimate for 2017</th>
<th>Estimate for 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synod Appro. &amp; Alloc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Cost Recov. Ord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Land Acquis. Levy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ord.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recov. Ord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Land Acquis. Levy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ord.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquis. Ord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ord.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Land Acquis. Levy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ord.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquis. Ord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ord.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Land Acquis. Levy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ord.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquis. Ord.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ord.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Land Acquis. Levy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ord.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USE OF FUNDS

#### Long Term Requirements

- Archbishop’s PR (Media Officer) 150
- Parish contribution to Archives 68
- **Ord.** 68

#### Immediate Requirements

- Membership/affiliation -
  - General Synod 432
  - Provincial Synod 12
  - Sydney Reps at General Synod 20
  - Freedom4Faith – affiliation fee 10
  - NSW Council of Churches 15
  - NCLS 50
- Sydney Synod-
  - Venue Hire & Printing 76
  - Committee members carparking 23
  - Secretariat – Synod, Stan Com & parishes 800
- Parish Insurance Program 3,500
- Parish Risk Management Program 217
- Professional Standards Unit
  - Parish related costs 546
  - Reimbursement the Synod Risk Reserve for non-standard expenses -
- Safe Ministry Training Program 103
- Provision for PCR remission 20
- Support for SAPAS 11
- Secretariat fee for managing PCR Fund 190
- Synod Risk Reserve (Fund 131) replenishment 220
- Cathedral – Diocesan contribution to recurrent funding needs -

**Ordinary Session of Synod: Proceedings for 2015**

**Continued...**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Training &amp; Development</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Property Committee – new church land</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Theological College</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthworks College</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Education Commission</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Media Council</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglicare – research</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism &amp; New Churches</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMOC – Anglican chaplaincy in tertiary education</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Outside the Diocese Committee</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthworks – Ministry Support Team</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE Office – SRE Primary Upgrade</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Howe Island</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,655</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,439</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,233</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Parochial Cost Recovery Charges & Church Land Acquisitions Levy for 2016 - 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parochial Network Costs</th>
<th>Actual for 2015</th>
<th>Proposed for 2016</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Estimated for 2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Estimated for 2018</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish property and liability insurance program</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4,100,000</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish risk management program</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>221,000</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Standards Unit - Parish related costs</td>
<td>546,000</td>
<td>751,000</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>766,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>781,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursing Synod Risk Reserve for non-standard expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe ministry training program</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for relief and remission of PCR charges</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-50.0%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish contribution to the cost of Diocesan archives</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Sydney Anglican Parish Accounting System (SAPAS)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for managing the PCR Fund 951</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>194,000</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>197,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Net Operating Receipts 2013 – actual: 95,483,432
Total Net Operating Receipts 2014 – estimate August 2015: 101,222,166
Total Net Operating Receipts 2015 – estimate: 104,258,831
Total Net Operating Receipts 2016 – estimate: 107,386,596

Variable PCR charge percentage (average all parochial units): 4.88% 5.17% 6.0% 5.09% -1.5% 5.15% 1.2%

### Ministry costs (per F/T minister)

#### Ministers, Assistant Ministers (7+ years, Senior Assistant Ministers)

| Cost per minister | 13,616 | 14,395 | 5.7% | 15,207 | 5.6% | 15,882 | 4.4% |

#### Assistant Ministers

| Cost per minister | 12,557 | 13,293 | 5.9% | 14,061 | 5.8% | 14,690 | 4.5% |

### Church Land Acquisitions Levy

<p>| Contribution to the acquisition of land for future church sites | 2,000,000 | 2,024,443 | 1.2% | 2,085,177 | 3.0% | 2,147,732 | 3.0% |
| Parish levy percentage | 2.09% | 2.00% | -4.5% | 2.00% | - | 2.00% | - |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parochial Network Costs</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Parishes with property</th>
<th>Parishes without property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,233,000</td>
<td>5.194610%</td>
<td>3.116766%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution to the acquisition of land for future church sites</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,024,443</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Net Operating Receipts for 2014 (estimate July 2015)</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101,222,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variable PCR Charge and Church Land Acquisitions Levy for 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish, Prov. P. R. Church, Prov. R.C.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Parochial Unit (Note 2)</th>
<th>Net Operating Receipts for 2014 (Note 1)</th>
<th>Variable PCR charge for 2016</th>
<th>Church Land Acquisition Levy for 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Abbotsford</td>
<td>129,352</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>2,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Albion Park</td>
<td>390,228</td>
<td>20,271</td>
<td>7,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>288,674</td>
<td>14,995</td>
<td>5,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Amciffe</td>
<td>239,841</td>
<td>12,459</td>
<td>4,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Artarmon</td>
<td>204,403</td>
<td>10,618</td>
<td>4,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ashbury</td>
<td>184,121</td>
<td>9,564</td>
<td>3,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ashfield Five Dock and Haberfield</td>
<td>929,919</td>
<td>48,306</td>
<td>18,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Asquith/Mt Colah/Mt Kuring-gai</td>
<td>374,900</td>
<td>19,475</td>
<td>7,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Auburn – St Philip</td>
<td>122,585</td>
<td>6,368</td>
<td>2,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Auburn – St Thomas</td>
<td>182,565</td>
<td>9,484</td>
<td>3,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Austinner</td>
<td>355,405</td>
<td>18,462</td>
<td>7,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Barrenjoey</td>
<td>329,552</td>
<td>17,119</td>
<td>6,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Balgowla</td>
<td>356,499</td>
<td>18,519</td>
<td>7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td>118,976</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>2,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Bankstown</td>
<td>98,560</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>1,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Baulkham Hills</td>
<td>259,651</td>
<td>13,488</td>
<td>5,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Beacon Hill</td>
<td>113,662</td>
<td>5,904</td>
<td>2,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Beecroft</td>
<td>344,164</td>
<td>17,878</td>
<td>6,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Bellevue Hill</td>
<td>215,514</td>
<td>11,195</td>
<td>4,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Belmore with McCallums Hill &amp; Clemton Park</td>
<td>154,267</td>
<td>8,014</td>
<td>3,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Belrose</td>
<td>359,896</td>
<td>18,695</td>
<td>7,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Beral</td>
<td>142,070</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>2,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Berowra</td>
<td>418,721</td>
<td>21,751</td>
<td>8,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Berrima cum Moss Vale</td>
<td>184,299</td>
<td>9,574</td>
<td>3,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>122,073</td>
<td>6,341</td>
<td>2,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Beverly Hills with Kingsgrove</td>
<td>411,010</td>
<td>21,350</td>
<td>8,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Blackheath</td>
<td>133,082</td>
<td>6,913</td>
<td>2,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>541,115</td>
<td>28,109</td>
<td>10,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Blakehurst</td>
<td>138,250</td>
<td>7,182</td>
<td>2,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Bomaderry</td>
<td>213,660</td>
<td>11,099</td>
<td>4,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Bondi</td>
<td>211,695</td>
<td>10,997</td>
<td>4,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Bowral</td>
<td>569,634</td>
<td>29,590</td>
<td>11,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Brighton/Rockdale</td>
<td>198,486</td>
<td>10,311</td>
<td>3,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>827,717</td>
<td>42,997</td>
<td>16,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Bulli</td>
<td>335,545</td>
<td>17,430</td>
<td>6,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Burwood</td>
<td>645,342</td>
<td>33,523</td>
<td>12,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Cabramatta</td>
<td>373,094</td>
<td>19,381</td>
<td>7,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Cambridge Park</td>
<td>141,889</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>2,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>615,799</td>
<td>31,988</td>
<td>12,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Campbelltown</td>
<td>661,811</td>
<td>34,379</td>
<td>13,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Campsie</td>
<td>192,498</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Canterbury with Hurlstone Park</td>
<td>144,162</td>
<td>7,489</td>
<td>2,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Caringbah</td>
<td>678,253</td>
<td>35,233</td>
<td>13,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Castle Hill</td>
<td>2,651,495</td>
<td>137,735</td>
<td>53,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Centennial Park</td>
<td>757,069</td>
<td>39,327</td>
<td>15,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Chatswood</td>
<td>822,847</td>
<td>42,744</td>
<td>16,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish, Prov. P., R. Church, Prov. R.C.</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Parochial Unit (Note 2)</td>
<td>Net Operating Receipts for 2014 (Note 1)</td>
<td>Variable PCR charge for 2016</td>
<td>Church Land Acquisition Levy for 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC(n)</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Cherrybrook #</td>
<td>264,373</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>5,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Chester Hill with Sefton</td>
<td>48,634</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Clovelly</td>
<td>298,465</td>
<td>15,504</td>
<td>5,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Cobbytta</td>
<td>199,452</td>
<td>10,361</td>
<td>3,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Concord &amp; Burwood</td>
<td>242,477</td>
<td>12,592</td>
<td>4,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Concord North</td>
<td>314,698</td>
<td>16,347</td>
<td>6,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Concord West</td>
<td>204,307</td>
<td>10,631</td>
<td>4,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Coogee</td>
<td>156,241</td>
<td>8,116</td>
<td>3,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Cooks River</td>
<td>138,468</td>
<td>7,193</td>
<td>2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Corrimal</td>
<td>173,896</td>
<td>9,033</td>
<td>3,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Cranebrook with Castlereagh</td>
<td>274,147</td>
<td>14,241</td>
<td>5,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Cremorne</td>
<td>251,727</td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>5,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Cronulla</td>
<td>240,384</td>
<td>12,487</td>
<td>4,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Carlingford and North Rocks</td>
<td>1,743,320</td>
<td>90,559</td>
<td>34,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>616,550</td>
<td>32,027</td>
<td>12,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Culburra Beach</td>
<td>115,084</td>
<td>5,978</td>
<td>2,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Dapto</td>
<td>724,258</td>
<td>37,622</td>
<td>14,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Darling Point</td>
<td>722,824</td>
<td>37,548</td>
<td>14,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Darling Street</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>27,791</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dee Why</td>
<td>264,027</td>
<td>13,715</td>
<td>5,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Denham Court</td>
<td>69,826</td>
<td>3,627</td>
<td>1,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Doonside</td>
<td>83,007</td>
<td>4,312</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Drummoynne</td>
<td>159,030</td>
<td>8,261</td>
<td>3,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Dulwich Hill</td>
<td>151,867</td>
<td>7,889</td>
<td>3,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Dundas/Telopea</td>
<td>364,228</td>
<td>18,920</td>
<td>7,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Dural District</td>
<td>431,003</td>
<td>22,389</td>
<td>8,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Eagle Vale</td>
<td>212,518</td>
<td>11,039</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Earlwood</td>
<td>361,525</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td>7,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>East Lindfield</td>
<td>315,947</td>
<td>16,308</td>
<td>6,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Darlinghurst</td>
<td>601,272</td>
<td>31,234</td>
<td>12,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Eastgardens</td>
<td>442,557</td>
<td>22,989</td>
<td>8,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td>842,084</td>
<td>43,743</td>
<td>16,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Emu Plains</td>
<td>343,081</td>
<td>17,822</td>
<td>6,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Enfield &amp; Strathfield</td>
<td>562,145</td>
<td>29,201</td>
<td>11,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Engadine</td>
<td>652,372</td>
<td>33,888</td>
<td>13,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Enmore/Stanmore</td>
<td>159,056</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>3,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Epping</td>
<td>384,861</td>
<td>19,992</td>
<td>7,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ermington</td>
<td>91,193</td>
<td>4,737</td>
<td>1,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Fairfield with Bossley Park</td>
<td>416,538</td>
<td>21,638</td>
<td>8,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Fairy Meadow</td>
<td>316,607</td>
<td>16,446</td>
<td>6,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Figtree</td>
<td>1,317,071</td>
<td>68,417</td>
<td>26,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Forestville</td>
<td>427,945</td>
<td>22,230</td>
<td>8,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Frenchs Forest</td>
<td>327,717</td>
<td>17,024</td>
<td>6,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td>285,325</td>
<td>14,822</td>
<td>5,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Georges Hall</td>
<td>139,489</td>
<td>7,246</td>
<td>2,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Gerringong</td>
<td>273,505</td>
<td>14,208</td>
<td>5,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Gladesville</td>
<td>974,104</td>
<td>50,601</td>
<td>19,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>269,032</td>
<td>13,975</td>
<td>5,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Glenhaven</td>
<td>453,228</td>
<td>23,543</td>
<td>9,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP(n)</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Glenmore Park #</td>
<td>677,980</td>
<td>35,218</td>
<td>13,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Glenquarie</td>
<td>109,675</td>
<td>5,697</td>
<td>2,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>532,330</td>
<td>27,652</td>
<td>10,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Granville</td>
<td>142,136</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>2,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Greenslopes</td>
<td>143,255</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>2,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Greenacre</td>
<td>100,011</td>
<td>5,195</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>105,257</td>
<td>5,468</td>
<td>2,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Greystanes – Merrylands West</td>
<td>107,459</td>
<td>5,582</td>
<td>2,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Guildford with Villawood</td>
<td>151,019</td>
<td>7,845</td>
<td>3,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Gymea</td>
<td>385,385</td>
<td>20,019</td>
<td>7,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish, Prov. P., R. Church, Prov. R.C.</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Parochial Unit (Note 2)</td>
<td>Net Operating Receipts for 2014 (Note 1)</td>
<td>Variable PCR charge for 2016</td>
<td>Church Land Acquisition Levy for 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC(np)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Harbour Church #</td>
<td>161,689</td>
<td>5,039</td>
<td>3,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Helensburgh and Stanwell Park</td>
<td>261,343</td>
<td>13,576</td>
<td>5,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Hornsby</td>
<td>143,856</td>
<td>7,473</td>
<td>2,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC(np)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Hornsby Anglican Chinese #</td>
<td>199,941</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>3,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Hornsby Heights</td>
<td>133,552</td>
<td>6,938</td>
<td>2,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Hoxton Park</td>
<td>302,964</td>
<td>15,738</td>
<td>6,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Hunters Hill</td>
<td>341,297</td>
<td>17,729</td>
<td>6,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Hurstville</td>
<td>460,885</td>
<td>23,941</td>
<td>9,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Hurstville Grove</td>
<td>416,089</td>
<td>21,614</td>
<td>8,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Huskisson</td>
<td>154,190</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>3,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Ingleburn</td>
<td>198,100</td>
<td>10,291</td>
<td>3,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Jamboree</td>
<td>82,408</td>
<td>4,281</td>
<td>1,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Jannali</td>
<td>759,264</td>
<td>39,441</td>
<td>15,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Kangaroo Valley</td>
<td>93,932</td>
<td>4,879</td>
<td>1,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Katoomba</td>
<td>228,399</td>
<td>11,864</td>
<td>4,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Keiraville</td>
<td>153,844</td>
<td>7,992</td>
<td>3,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Kellyville</td>
<td>468,234</td>
<td>24,323</td>
<td>9,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Kensington Eastlakes</td>
<td>155,158</td>
<td>8,060</td>
<td>3,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Kiama</td>
<td>452,281</td>
<td>23,494</td>
<td>9,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Killara</td>
<td>319,535</td>
<td>16,599</td>
<td>6,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Kingsford</td>
<td>143,024</td>
<td>7,430</td>
<td>2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Kingswood</td>
<td>320,698</td>
<td>16,659</td>
<td>6,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kirribilli</td>
<td>1,181,857</td>
<td>61,393</td>
<td>23,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Kurnajong</td>
<td>309,866</td>
<td>16,096</td>
<td>6,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Lakemba</td>
<td>60,644</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Latol Park and Kings Langley</td>
<td>203,264</td>
<td>10,559</td>
<td>4,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Lane Cove and Mowbray</td>
<td>539,799</td>
<td>28,040</td>
<td>10,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Lavender Bay</td>
<td>321,734</td>
<td>16,713</td>
<td>6,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td>96,016</td>
<td>4,988</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>269,910</td>
<td>14,021</td>
<td>5,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Leura</td>
<td>143,804</td>
<td>7,470</td>
<td>2,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Lidcombe</td>
<td>243,127</td>
<td>12,629</td>
<td>4,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Lindfield</td>
<td>597,566</td>
<td>31,041</td>
<td>11,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Lithgow</td>
<td>248,347</td>
<td>12,901</td>
<td>4,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>353,963</td>
<td>18,387</td>
<td>7,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Liverpool South</td>
<td>139,440</td>
<td>7,243</td>
<td>2,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Longueville</td>
<td>251,934</td>
<td>13,087</td>
<td>5,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Lord Howe Island</td>
<td>21,338</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Lower Mountains</td>
<td>508,428</td>
<td>26,411</td>
<td>10,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Lugarno</td>
<td>131,019</td>
<td>6,806</td>
<td>2,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Macquarie</td>
<td>541,377</td>
<td>28,122</td>
<td>10,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Malabar</td>
<td>331,122</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>6,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>1,403,942</td>
<td>72,929</td>
<td>28,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Maroubra</td>
<td>312,059</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>6,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Marrickville</td>
<td>342,286</td>
<td>17,780</td>
<td>6,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Menai</td>
<td>803,001</td>
<td>41,713</td>
<td>16,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Menangle</td>
<td>136,766</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>2,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Merrylands</td>
<td>231,767</td>
<td>12,039</td>
<td>4,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Minchinbury</td>
<td>282,258</td>
<td>14,662</td>
<td>5,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Minto</td>
<td>284,413</td>
<td>14,774</td>
<td>5,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>942,192</td>
<td>48,943</td>
<td>18,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Mittagong</td>
<td>289,693</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td>5,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mona Vale</td>
<td>329,098</td>
<td>17,095</td>
<td>6,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Moorebank</td>
<td>371,047</td>
<td>19,274</td>
<td>7,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mosman – St Clement’s</td>
<td>780,419</td>
<td>40,540</td>
<td>15,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mosman – St Luke’s</td>
<td>379,273</td>
<td>19,702</td>
<td>7,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Mt Druitt</td>
<td>126,611</td>
<td>6,577</td>
<td>2,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Mulgoa</td>
<td>133,896</td>
<td>6,955</td>
<td>2,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W Narellan</td>
<td>279,094</td>
<td>14,498</td>
<td>5,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Naremburn/Cammeray</td>
<td>1,251,396</td>
<td>65,005</td>
<td>25,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Narrabeen</td>
<td>836,374</td>
<td>43,446</td>
<td>16,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Neutral Bay</td>
<td>458,212</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>9,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Newport</td>
<td>162,566</td>
<td>8,445</td>
<td>3,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S Newtown with Enskineville</td>
<td>545,264</td>
<td>28,324</td>
<td>10,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Normanhurst</td>
<td>580,108</td>
<td>30,134</td>
<td>11,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Christ Churches Northern Beaches</td>
<td>243,768</td>
<td>12,663</td>
<td>4,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N North Epping</td>
<td>424,119</td>
<td>22,031</td>
<td>8,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N North Ryde</td>
<td>132,738</td>
<td>6,895</td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N North Sydney</td>
<td>1,799,564</td>
<td>93,480</td>
<td>35,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Northbridge</td>
<td>403,326</td>
<td>20,951</td>
<td>8,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Northmead and Winston Hills</td>
<td>647,166</td>
<td>33,618</td>
<td>12,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Norwest</td>
<td>599,894</td>
<td>31,162</td>
<td>11,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W Nowra</td>
<td>350,376</td>
<td>18,201</td>
<td>7,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W Oak Flats</td>
<td>236,273</td>
<td>12,273</td>
<td>4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Oakhurst</td>
<td>223,019</td>
<td>11,585</td>
<td>4,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G Oatley West</td>
<td>148,480</td>
<td>7,713</td>
<td>2,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G Oatley</td>
<td>216,866</td>
<td>11,265</td>
<td>4,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>PP(n)</td>
<td>W Oran Park #</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S Paddington</td>
<td>157,245</td>
<td>8,168</td>
<td>3,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G Padstow</td>
<td>108,916</td>
<td>5,658</td>
<td>2,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G Panania</td>
<td>410,106</td>
<td>21,303</td>
<td>8,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Parramatta</td>
<td>1,569,031</td>
<td>81,505</td>
<td>31,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Parramatta North with Harris Park</td>
<td>244,120</td>
<td>12,681</td>
<td>4,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G Peakhurst/Mortdale</td>
<td>285,629</td>
<td>14,837</td>
<td>5,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Penrith</td>
<td>393,019</td>
<td>20,416</td>
<td>7,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G Penshurst</td>
<td>231,439</td>
<td>12,022</td>
<td>4,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S Petersham</td>
<td>241,733</td>
<td>12,587</td>
<td>4,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>PRC(n)</td>
<td>N Philadelphia Anglican Church #</td>
<td>113,111</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>2,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W Picton</td>
<td>90,565</td>
<td>4,704</td>
<td>1,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>WS Pitt Town</td>
<td>439,648</td>
<td>22,838</td>
<td>8,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>W Port Kembla</td>
<td>142,785</td>
<td>7,417</td>
<td>2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>N Putney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Pymble</td>
<td>756,368</td>
<td>39,290</td>
<td>15,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Quakers Hill</td>
<td>815,690</td>
<td>42,372</td>
<td>16,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S Randwick</td>
<td>671,311</td>
<td>34,872</td>
<td>13,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>G Regents Park</td>
<td>48,140</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>G Revesby</td>
<td>75,330</td>
<td>3,913</td>
<td>1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Richmond</td>
<td>173,063</td>
<td>8,990</td>
<td>3,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>WS Riverstone</td>
<td>140,534</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>2,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G Riverwood – Punchbowl</td>
<td>324,947</td>
<td>16,880</td>
<td>6,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W Robertson</td>
<td>105,027</td>
<td>5,456</td>
<td>2,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Rooty Hill</td>
<td>1,084,665</td>
<td>56,344</td>
<td>21,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>W Rosemeadow</td>
<td>132,409</td>
<td>6,878</td>
<td>2,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Roseville</td>
<td>920,905</td>
<td>47,837</td>
<td>18,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Roseville East</td>
<td>191,122</td>
<td>9,928</td>
<td>3,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>WS Rouse Hill</td>
<td>253,135</td>
<td>13,149</td>
<td>5,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Ryde</td>
<td>630,220</td>
<td>32,737</td>
<td>12,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>G Sadleir</td>
<td>282,147</td>
<td>14,856</td>
<td>5,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G Sans Souci</td>
<td>181,486</td>
<td>9,427</td>
<td>3,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N Seaforth</td>
<td>234,671</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>4,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS Seven Hills</td>
<td>295,471</td>
<td>15,349</td>
<td>5,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W Shellharbour</td>
<td>176,762</td>
<td>9,182</td>
<td>3,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W Shellharbour City Centre</td>
<td>472,577</td>
<td>24,549</td>
<td>9,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W Shoalhaven Heads</td>
<td>126,174</td>
<td>6,554</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G Smithfield Road</td>
<td>203,352</td>
<td>10,563</td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G South Carlton</td>
<td>270,433</td>
<td>14,048</td>
<td>5,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish, Prov. P., R. Church, Prov. R.C.</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Parochial Unit (Note 2)</td>
<td>Net Operating Receipts for 2014 (Note 1)</td>
<td>Variable PCR charge for 2016</td>
<td>Church Land Acquisition Levy for 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>South Coogee</td>
<td>139,055</td>
<td>7,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>South Creek</td>
<td>259,065</td>
<td>13,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>South Hurstville</td>
<td>154,557</td>
<td>8,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>South Sydney</td>
<td>173,910</td>
<td>9,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Springwood</td>
<td>700,625</td>
<td>36,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>St Clair</td>
<td>116,566</td>
<td>6,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>St George</td>
<td>110,976</td>
<td>5,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>St George North</td>
<td>798,241</td>
<td>41,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>St Ives</td>
<td>1,786,289</td>
<td>92,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>St Marys</td>
<td>297,777</td>
<td>15,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Strathfield and Homebush</td>
<td>276,914</td>
<td>14,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Summer Hill</td>
<td>296,397</td>
<td>15,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>278,965</td>
<td>14,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Sussex Inlet</td>
<td>103,807</td>
<td>5,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>331,931</td>
<td>17,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Sutton Forest</td>
<td>261,379</td>
<td>13,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>St Laurence</td>
<td>487,766</td>
<td>25,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Cathedral of St Andrew</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>1,474,913</td>
<td>76,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Church Hill</td>
<td>1,086,523</td>
<td>56,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Sylvania</td>
<td>294,550</td>
<td>15,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>The Oaks</td>
<td>135,998</td>
<td>7,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Thornleigh – Pennant Hills</td>
<td>470,175</td>
<td>24,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Toongabbie</td>
<td>476,923</td>
<td>24,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Turramurra</td>
<td>1,094,163</td>
<td>56,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Turramurra South</td>
<td>495,749</td>
<td>25,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Ulladulla</td>
<td>260,342</td>
<td>13,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>RC(np)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Unichurch (Uni. NSW) #</td>
<td>468,720</td>
<td>14,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Vaucluse and Rose Bay</td>
<td>288,520</td>
<td>14,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Wahroonga – St Andrew’s</td>
<td>311,614</td>
<td>16,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Wahroonga – St Paul’s</td>
<td>229,784</td>
<td>11,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Waitara</td>
<td>263,560</td>
<td>13,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Watsons Bay</td>
<td>259,290</td>
<td>13,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>240,563</td>
<td>12,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Wentworth Falls</td>
<td>233,007</td>
<td>12,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Wentworthville</td>
<td>159,300</td>
<td>8,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>West Lindfield</td>
<td>197,212</td>
<td>10,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>West Pennant Hills</td>
<td>927,442</td>
<td>48,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>West Pymble</td>
<td>654,455</td>
<td>33,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>West Ryde</td>
<td>454,052</td>
<td>23,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>West Wollongong</td>
<td>352,436</td>
<td>18,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Westmead</td>
<td>136,828</td>
<td>7,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Wilberforce</td>
<td>271,406</td>
<td>14,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Willoughby</td>
<td>423,543</td>
<td>22,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Willoughby East</td>
<td>199,329</td>
<td>10,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>124,559</td>
<td>6,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Wollondilly</td>
<td>223,874</td>
<td>11,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>768,733</td>
<td>39,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Woollahra</td>
<td>162,998</td>
<td>8,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Yagoona</td>
<td>231,510</td>
<td>12,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. There is only one parish (Gordon) that had not submitted audited financial statements for 2014 by 19 August 2014 (shown in italics, shaded). For this purpose their 2014 Net Operating Receipts have been assumed to be unchanged from their 2013 NOR. If the 2014 audited financial statements are still outstanding at the time the actual 2016 parochial cost recovery charges are due to be invoiced later this year, the Finance Committee has approved the use of a charge for this parish based on 2013 NOR + 20%.

2. The 7 parochial units without property (shown marked with #) are charged a lower rate of variable PCR reflecting the absence of the component for the property insurance premium, except that Glenmore Park has volunteered to pay the variable charge percentage applicable to parishes with property.
Synod Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance 2015

No 30, 2015

Long Title
An Ordinance to authorise appropriations and allocations for 2016 and to indicate the Synod’s intentions for allocations for 2017 and 2018.

Preamble
By the Synod Estimates Ordinance 1998, the Standing Committee is to prepare for the second ordinary session of the 50th Synod a proposed ordinance which contains estimates for each of the following 3 financial years of –

(a) the amount required for meeting the cost of sittings of the Synod, the maintenance of the diocesan offices and the expenses of such other diocesan activities and commitments as, in the opinion of the Standing Committee, should be supported,

(b) the amount which, in the opinion of the Standing Committee, should be granted to organisations under the control of Synod or to other organisations, and

(c) the amount available for distribution from endowments or other trusts for meeting the amounts referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) which, in the opinion of the Standing Committee, may prudently be applied towards meeting the amounts referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) in the relevant financial year,

with such estimates to reflect the statement of funding principles and priorities prepared for the first ordinary session of the 50th Synod.

The Synod of the Diocese of Sydney Ordains as follows.

1. Name
This Ordinance is the Synod Appropriations and Allocations Ordinance 2015.

2. Interpretation
In this Ordinance –

“Allocations Report” means the part of Attachment 1 to Standing Committee’s report to the Synod about this Ordinance headed “USE OF FUNDS”.

“Income Report” means the part of Attachment 1 to Standing Committee’s report to the Synod about this Ordinance headed “SOURCE OF FUNDS”.

3. Declarations
By reason of circumstances arising after the creation of the trusts on which the amounts referred to in the column headed “Proposed for 2016 – Synod Appro. & Alloc. Ord.” in the Income Report are held it is inexpedient to carry out or observe those trusts or to deal with or apply those amounts solely for the same or like purposes as those trusts.

4. Variation of trusts
The trusts on which the amounts referred to in clause 3 above are held are varied to the extent necessary to permit the allocations under clause 5.

5. Appropriations and Allocations for 2016

(2) If, in the opinion of the Standing Committee, all or any part of an amount referred to in subclause (1) is not required or cannot be applied for the specified purpose, the Standing Committee may by resolution reallocate that amount or part to another purpose.

6. Indication of intention for Appropriations and Allocations for 2017 and 2018

(2) The Synod directs that the Standing Committee pass all such ordinances as may be necessary, from time to time, to give effect to the Synod’s intention.
I Certify that the Ordinance as printed is in accordance with the Ordinance as reported.

R TONG
Chair of Committees

I Certify that this Ordinance was passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 13 October 2015.

R WICKS
Secretary of Synod

I Assent to this Ordinance.

GN DAVIES
Archbishop of Sydney
19/10/2015
Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2015

No 31, 2015

Long Title
An ordinance to determine the costs for parochial units and for a levy for the acquisition of land for church sites payable by parochial units in 2016, 2017 and 2018, to authorise the application of such charges and for incidental purposes.

Preamble
A. Under clause 4 of the Cost Recoveries Framework Ordinance 2008 (the “Framework Ordinance”), a parochial unit is to pay a cost recoveries charge each year in respect of ministry costs and parochial network costs specified or determined in accordance with an ordinance referred to in clause 5 of the Framework Ordinance.

B. By clause 5(3) of the Framework Ordinance, the Standing Committee is to prepare for the second ordinary session of the 50th Synod a proposed ordinance for adoption by the Synod which specifies the cost recoveries charge to be paid by each parochial unit in 2016, 2017 and 2018, or the method or methods by which such charge may be determined by the Standing Committee, and authorises the Standing Committee to apply such cost recoveries charges paid by parochial units in a financial year toward ministry costs and parochial network costs.

C. The statement of funding principles and priorities prepared by the Standing Committee for the first ordinary session of the 50th Synod and the first ordinary session of each Synod thereafter under clause 3(3) of the Synod Estimates Ordinance 1998 contemplates the payment of a levy by parochial units in 2016, 2017 and 2018 for the acquisition of land for church sites.

The Synod of the Diocese of Sydney Ordains as follows.

1. Name of Ordinance
This Ordinance is the Parochial Cost Recoveries and Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2015.

2. Definitions
In this Ordinance –

“year” means a period of 12 calendar months commencing on 1 January.

“ministry costs” means the costs, expenses, charges or contributions for the year referred to or contemplated under clause 2(2)(a) of the Framework Ordinance.

“parochial network costs” means –

(a) the costs, expenses, charges or contributions for the year referred to or contemplated under clause 2(2)(b) of the Framework Ordinance, and

(b) the cost of the parish risk management program, and

(c) the parish related costs for the year of the Professional Standards Unit, and

(d) in 2016, the cost of reimbursing Synod Fund 131 for non-standard expenses previously incurred by the Professional Standards Unit and paid from Synod Fund 131, and

(e) the cost of the safe ministry training program, and

(f) a $68,000 contribution towards the costs of the Diocesan Archives, and

(g) a $10,000 provision for the relief or remission of parochial cost recoveries charges, and

(h) the cost of the Sydney Diocesan Secretariat’s fee for managing the Parochial Cost Recoveries Fund 951.

“parochial unit” means a parish, provisional parish, recognised church or provisional recognised church in the Diocese of Sydney.

“parochial unit with property” means a parochial unit for which real property is held on trust or which has the use of real property held as part of the fund constituted under the Mission Property Ordinance 2002.

“church land acquisition projects” means the acquisition of land for church sites in areas in the Diocese which are experiencing or are likely to experience a rapid increase in population in accordance with the priorities determined under clause 5C of the Mission Property Ordinance 2002.
"Mission Property Fund" means the fund constituted under the Mission Property Ordinance 2002.

3. **Cost recoveries charge**

   (1) In 2016, 2017 and 2018 each parochial unit is to pay a cost recoveries charge calculated according to the formula in the Schedule.

   (2) The cost recoveries charge paid by a parochial unit under subclause (1) is to be applied to the payment of the ministry costs and parochial network costs incurred, or to be incurred, in the year for which that charge is paid.

   (3) The Standing Committee is to report to the third ordinary session of the 50th Synod about –

      (a) the ministry costs and parochial network costs payable in 2017 and an estimate of the amounts payable, and

      (b) the cost recoveries charge estimated to be payable by each parochial unit in 2017 and details of how that charge is calculated.

   (4) The Standing Committee is to report to the first ordinary session of the 51st Synod about –

      (a) the ministry costs and parochial network costs payable in 2018 and an estimate of the amounts payable, and

      (b) the cost recoveries charge estimated to be payable by each parochial unit in 2018 and details of how that charge is calculated.

4. **Church land levy**

   (1) In 2016, 2017 and 2018 each parochial unit is to pay a levy calculated as 2.0% of the Net Operating Receipts of the relevant parochial unit for 2014, 2015 and 2016 respectively, determined under Part 3 of the Framework Ordinance.

   (2) The levy is payable by 10 equal instalments in each year, the first due and payable on 1 March and subsequent instalments due and payable on the first day of each succeeding month.

   (3) The levy paid by a parochial unit under subclause (1) is to be paid as an addition to the Mission Property Fund and applied towards church land acquisition projects.

   **Schedule: Cost Recoveries Charge**

   1. The cost recoveries charge payable by a parochial unit for a year is –

      (a) in the case of St Andrew’s Cathedral, the minister and assistant minister charge for that year, and

      (b) in the case of any other parochial unit, the sum of –

         (i) the minister and assistant minister charge for that year, and

         (ii) the variable charge for that year,

      but if –

      (c) the contributions, costs and charges for a minister or assistant minister are paid by another parochial unit or body, or do not apply to the minister or assistant minister, a pro rata rebate of the appropriate portion of the minister or assistant minister charge is granted for that part or parts of the year for which that minister or assistant minister is licensed, and

      (d) if a minister or assistant minister is licensed to the parochial unit only for part or parts of the year, an appropriate portion of the minister and assistant minister charge is payable for such part or parts.

   2. In this Schedule –

      “assistant minister” means an assistant minister or a senior assistant minister within the meaning of the Assistant Ministers Ordinance 1990 licensed to the parochial unit.

      “minister” means –

      (a) the person licensed to the parochial unit as rector, and

      (b) in the absence or incapacity of a person referred to in paragraph (a) or during any vacancy in office of the rector of the parochial unit, the person appointed under rule 9.7 in Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 of the Parish Administration Ordinance 2008 for the time being to exercise all or any of the functions of the rector.
“minister and assistant minister charge” means, for each minister and assistant minister licensed to the parochial unit, the sum of the following costs and charges –

(a) the costs of the contribution or contributions to a superannuation fund at the rate determined from time to time under the *Sydney Diocesan Superannuation Fund Ordinance 1961*, and

(b) the costs of the contribution required to the Sydney Long Service Leave Fund in order to enable that Fund to make the payment or payments required to be made under the *Long Service Leave Canon 2010* in 2016, 2017 and 2018, and

(c) the costs of the contribution or contributions to fund the Sydney Diocesan Sickness and Accident Fund, and

(d) the costs of effecting stipend continuance insurance.


“determined percentage” means the ratio, expressed as a percentage, determined by the Standing Committee in accordance with the following formula –

\[
\frac{PC}{TR}
\]

where –

PC is the total estimated amount of all parochial network costs payable in 2016, 2017 and 2018, and

TR is the total of the Net Operating Receipts of all parochial units, except for St Andrew’s Cathedral, for 2014, 2015 and 2016 respectively,

provided that –

(a) in the case of a parochial unit with property, the determined percentage is adjusted upwards to the extent necessary to meet any shortfall in the recovery of the estimated amount of all parochial network costs associated with property payable in a year due to the reduction in the determined percentage for parochial units without property under paragraph (b), and

(b) in the case of a parochial unit without property, the determined percentage is 60% of the determined percentage calculated under paragraph (a).

I Certify that the Ordinance as printed is in accordance with the Ordinance as reported.

R TONG
Chair of Committees

I Certify that this Ordinance was passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 13 October 2015.

R WICKS
Secretary of Synod

I Assent to this Ordinance.

GN DAVIES
Archbishop of Sydney
19/10/2015
Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2015

Explanatory Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The bill regulates the conduct of ministry within the Anglican schools of the Diocese and replaces the School Chapels and Chaplains Ordinance 1975.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It expresses an expectation that schools and parishes have a shared commitment to partnership in proclaiming the Lord Jesus Christ to both the school and parish communities, irrespective of whether or not the school is extra-parochial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It provides for the appointment, dismissal and suspension of chaplains and assistant chaplains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It sets out the duties, qualifications and licensing requirements for chaplains and assistant chaplains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It provides that the strategic planning process of a school should incorporate a ministry plan, which is to include the delivery of Christian Education, the delivery of Biblical Studies to all years of the School, strategies for providing pastoral care to staff and students, and strategies for presenting the gospel to the school community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to provide explanatory notes for the bill for the Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2015 (the “bill”), which is being promoted to the 2nd session of the 50th Synod in 2015 pursuant to resolution 2/14 which is as follows –

   “Synod, noting the report 4/13 Review of School Chapels and Chaplains Ordinance 1975, requests the Standing Committee to consult with Chaplains and Heads of Diocesan Schools in respect to the exposure draft and to bring a bill for an ordinance to the 2015 session of the Synod having regard to any comments that are received.”

Recommendation

2. The Synod pass the bill as an ordinance of the Synod.

Background

3. A sub-committee was first appointed by the Standing Committee in 2009 to review the School Chapels and Chaplains Ordinance 1975 (the “1975 Ordinance”).

4. The Synod received a report from the sub-committee at its 2012 session and resolved to encourage Synod members and school councils to consider and comment on the report with a view to amending legislation being brought to the 2013 session.

5. In 2013, the Synod received a further report from the sub-committee summarising the submissions that had been received. The Synod resolved to request the Standing Committee to appoint a further committee, with appropriate representation from chaplains and heads of schools (or their nominees), to consider the submissions and bring amending legislation to the 2014 session.

6. The Standing Committee appointed a committee composed of Mr Tony Willis (Chair), Dr Bryan Cowling (Director of the Anglican Education Commission), Mrs Jodi Crain (Chaplain of Roseville College), the Rev Dr Nick Foord (Community Chaplain, Shore), Mrs Sue Middlebrook (Head of Tara Anglican School for Girls) and Dr David Nockles (Head of Macarthur Anglican School).

7. The Committee considered that the 1975 Ordinance should be replaced rather than amended. The Committee introduced a bill at the 2014 session of Synod as an exposure draft. The Synod resolved that further consultation be undertaken with schools and chaplains with a view to bringing a bill to the 2015 session of Synod, having regard to any submissions received.

8. The Committee received submissions from the Anglican Education Commission, Campbelltown Anglican Schools Council, Sydney Anglican Schools Ministry Association Committee, SHORE School, Ms B Lihou (Chaplain, SCECGS Redlands), St Andrew’s Cathedral School and Tara Anglican School for Girls. The Archbishop also met with a number of chaplains at the end of April 2015 and heads of schools...
in May 2015. The Committee has been informed about these discussions. The Committee has had regard to these submissions and discussions in revising the bill.

9. One member of the Committee, the Rev Dr Nick Foord does not support the proposed Ordinance in its current form. Dr Foord’s concern is that the proposed Ordinance only requires that the Archbishop be consulted by the Head of a School prior to dismissing a chaplain. Dr Foord considers the Archbishop’s approval should be required. Dr Foord has asked that this report note that he was the only clergyperson and chaplain on the Committee. While Mrs Crain is a lay chaplain and also a member of the Committee, she commenced maternity leave before the Committee deliberated on the question of the dismissal of chaplains.

Explaination

10. The purpose of the bill is to regulate ministry within the Anglican schools of the Diocese. It will replace the 1975 Ordinance.

Clause 3: relationship between schools and parishes

11. The bill contains a statement of expectation in clause 3(1) that schools and parishes have a shared commitment to partnership in proclaiming the Lord Jesus Christ to both the school and parish communities. This is the case irrespective of whether or not the school is extra-parochial.

12. The 1975 Ordinance contains provisions for making extra-parochial declarations concerning schools. The bill provides for the declaration process to revert to the Extra-Parochial Ordinance 1918 (the “1918 Ordinance”) except that the provisions in the bill for the appointment and removal of chaplains will apply in place of clause 2 of the 1918 Ordinance.

13. Clauses 4, 5 and 6 of the bill apply only in relation to extra-parochial schools. Clause 7 regulates chaplaincy in schools which have not been declared extra-parochial.

Clause 4: appointment, dismissal and suspension of chaplains and assistant chaplains

14. A chaplain is defined in clause 2, in relation to a school which is extra-parochial, as being “a person who holds a position within the School that primarily involves the delivery of Christian ministry to the School community”.

15. Clause 4 provides for the head of a school to appoint and dismiss chaplains and assistant chaplains in and for the school, in consultation with the school council and the Archbishop. The head may also temporarily suspend a chaplain or assistant chaplain but must provide immediate notification of the suspension to the Archbishop.

16. This is a change from the 1975 Ordinance under which –
   (a) appointment is by the school council with the approval of the Archbishop, and
   (b) dismissal is by the school council with notification of the dismissal to the Archbishop, whereupon the Archbishop has power to revoke the chaplain’s licence in accordance with certain disciplinary ordinances and the Anglican Church of Australia Constitution Act 1902.

17. The Committee considers that the appointment of staff is a matter for the head (being the most senior executive of the school) rather than the school council (whose primary function is governance). However the role of the chaplain and assistant chaplain is such that the head must consult with the school council and the Archbishop before making an appointment. However the Archbishop must also give his licence before the person put forward by the head can become the chaplain; so in effect, an appointment can only proceed with the Archbishop’s approval.

18. The requirement for the head to consult the school council and the Archbishop in relation to dismissal will provide an opportunity for the school council and the Archbishop to attempt to persuade the head not to proceed with the dismissal should they have reservations. The Committee considered whether it would be preferable to require a head to obtain the Archbishop’s approval before dismissing a chaplain. The majority favoured the Archbishop’s role being limited to consultation. As noted at paragraph 9, one member of the Committee, the Rev Dr Nick Foord considers that the Archbishop’s approval should be required.

Clause 5: duties, qualifications and licensing of chaplains

19. Clause 5(1) sets out a high level duty statement for school chaplains, being “to teach the students the doctrines of Christ and to exercise a pastoral ministry within the school community, especially to staff and students”. This will complement such other duties as may be apportioned by the head of the school from time to time.

20. By clause 5(2), it will be mandatory for the head of a school to apply to the Archbishop for a licence for any person who is proposed to be a chaplain in the school. As discussed above, a head will only be able to appoint a person as a chaplain if that licence is granted.
21. By clause 5(3) a chaplain’s licence must include a provision that it will cease upon the chaplain ceasing to be a member of the staff of the school. There will not be a further step whereby the Archbishop considers the revocation of the chaplain’s licence since the licence will cease according to its terms upon the dismissal of the chaplain.

22. By clause 5(4) if a chaplain ceases to hold the licence (whether due to resignation or revocation) he or she will cease to be entitled to act as chaplain or to hold himself or herself out as being the chaplain. However loss of the licence will not have the effect of dismissing the chaplain from being a member of the staff of the school. This would be a second step initiated by the head. Alternatively a head could decide to retain the person as a staff member in a capacity other than chaplain.

23. By clauses 5(5) and (6), a chaplain may be an ordained or lay person, but must hold a qualification in theology, commensurate to the position (preferably a bachelor degree), that is acceptable to the Archbishop. This is the minimum requirement. The Archbishop may see fit to impose other requirements before issuing a licence.

24. By clause 5(7) a person may only be given the title chaplain if the requirements of clause 5 have been satisfied.

Clause 6: assistant chaplains

25. An assistant chaplain is defined in clause 2 as being “a person who is responsible to and assists the Chaplain in their duties”.

26. The requirements in clause 6 for the qualifications and licensing of assistant chaplains are materially equivalent to those required for chaplains in clause 5.

Clause 7: chaplaincy in schools that are not extra-parochial

27. By clause 7(1), in the case of a school that is not extra-parochial, the rector of the parish in which the school is situated (or predominantly situated) will be the chaplain of the school. However by clause 7(2) the rector may apply to the Archbishop to license another person as chaplain in place of the rector, or as assistant chaplain to assist the rector in his duties as chaplain. A person who has been licensed under clause 7(2) can be suspended or dismissed by the Head in accordance with clause 7(3).

Clause 8: school ministry plan

28. By clause 8, the strategic planning process of a school should incorporate a ministry plan, which is to include –

(a) the delivery of Christian Education,
(b) the delivery of Biblical Studies to all years of the School,
(c) strategies for providing pastoral care to staff and students, and
(d) strategies for presenting the gospel to the school community.

29. The term “Christian Education” is defined in clause 2 as being – “the presentation of the whole curriculum within a Christian worldview founded on the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, as well as any distinctive Biblical Studies curriculum”.

30. This requirement has been inserted in recognition that Anglican ministry within diocesan schools involves more than the appointment of a chaplain, though the chaplain and the strategic planning process of a school work hand in hand. It is hoped that the clause will provide a formal basis for heads, school councils and chaplains to engage in strategic planning concerning ministry within their schools.

Clause 9: chapels

31. The bill makes brief provision for the licensing of chapels and the custody of service registers. Increasingly schools are utilising multipurpose facilities for chapel services.

Clause 10: Transition

32. It is not intended that any person holding the position of chaplain or assistant chaplain in a school be disqualified from that position by virtue of the introduction of the requirements in clauses 5 and 6. Any such person will be deemed to meet the requirements to the extent they apply to the chaplain or assistant chaplain in that school. If a chaplain or assistant chaplain leaves their current school and applies to be a chaplain or assistant chaplain at another school, they will need to meet the requirements in clauses 5 and 6 in relation to that new position.
33. Any school declared extra-parochial under the 1975 Ordinance will be deemed to have been declared extra-parochial under the 1918 Ordinance.

Clause 11: Repeal

34. The bill will repeal the 1975 Ordinance.

Clause 12: Commencement

35. The bill will commence on 1 January 2016.

For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.

ROBERT WICKS
Diocesan Secretary

17 August 2015
Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2015

Long Title
An Ordinance to regulate ministry within the Anglican schools of the Diocese.

1. Name
This Ordinance is the Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2015.

2. Interpretation
In this Ordinance –

“Anglican School” means an Anglican school, not being a Diocesan School, which is situated in the Diocese.

“Assistant Chaplain” means a person who is responsible to and assists the Chaplain in their duties.

“Chaplain” means –

(a) in relation to a School which is extra-parochial, a person who holds a position within the School that primarily involves the delivery of Christian ministry to the School community, and

(b) in relation to a School which is not extra-parochial, the person who is the Chaplain in accordance with clause 8 or 10.

“Christian Education” includes the presentation of the whole curriculum within a Christian worldview founded on the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, as well as any distinctive Biblical Studies curriculum.

“Diocesan School” means any school that is constituted by or under an ordinance of the Synod of the Diocese or in relation to which the Synod is empowered to make ordinances, and includes schools of the Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation.

“Parish” means a parish or provisional parish constituted under or recognised as such for the purposes of the Parishes Ordinance 1979.

“Rector” includes a person fulfilling the function of rector in a parish on a temporary basis, such as an acting rector.

“School” means a Diocesan School or an Anglican School.

“School Council” means the body having governance responsibility for the School.

3. Relationship between Schools and Parishes
(1) Where it is deemed beneficial, a School Council may apply for its School to be declared extra-parochial under the Extra-Parochial Ordinance 1918.

(2) Clause 2 of the Extra-Parochial Ordinance 1918 does not apply to a Diocesan School which is declared to be and remains extra-parochial pursuant to that Ordinance.

(3) Clauses 5, 6 and 7 of this Ordinance apply only in respect to Diocesan Schools which are extra-parochial.

(4) Regardless of whether a School is extra-parochial, Schools and Parishes are encouraged to have a shared commitment to partnership in proclaiming the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ to the School and Parish communities.

4. Exercise of the School Council’s functions by the Head
Unless the School Council of a Diocesan School otherwise provides, the Head may exercise any of the School Council’s functions under this Ordinance in consultation with the School Council.

5. Chaplains and Assistant Chaplains in Diocesan Schools that are extra parochial: appointment, dismissal and suspension
(1) Subject to clauses 6(2) and 7(1), the School Council of any Diocesan School may appoint one or more Chaplains or Assistant Chaplains as members of staff in and for the School.
(2) The School Council of any Diocesan School may, in consultation with the Archbishop, dismiss such Chaplains or Assistant Chaplains.

(3) The Head of any Diocesan School may temporarily suspend a Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain from their duties as Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain, but thereupon must immediately notify the Archbishop and the School Council of such action.

6. Chaplains in Diocesan Schools that are extra parochial: duties, qualifications and licensing

(1) The duties of the Chaplain in a Diocesan School, notwithstanding any other responsibilities they may have as a staff member, shall be to teach the students the doctrines of Christ and to exercise a pastoral ministry within the school community, especially to staff and students.

(2) The School Council of a Diocesan School must apply to the Archbishop for a licence for any person who is proposed to be a Chaplain in the School, and may only appoint a person as a Chaplain in the School if the licence is granted. The licence shall provide that it will cease upon the Chaplain’s ceasing to be a member of the staff of the School.

(3) If at any time and for any reason, a Chaplain in a Diocesan School ceases to hold the licence, they will cease to be entitled to act as Chaplain of the School, and must not thereafter hold themselves out as having this title. This will not of itself have the effect of removing the person from being a member of the staff of the School.

(4) A Chaplain in a Diocesan School –
   (a) may be an ordained or a lay person,
   (b) must hold a qualification in theology, preferably a bachelor degree, commensurate with the position to which they are appointed, that is acceptable to the Archbishop, and
   (c) should, wherever possible, also hold an appropriate educational qualification.

(5) A person must not be given the title of Chaplain in a Diocesan School unless the requirements of this clause have been satisfied.

7. Assistant Chaplains in Diocesan Schools that are extra parochial: qualifications and licensing

(1) The School Council of a Diocesan School must apply to the Archbishop for a licence for any person who is proposed to be an Assistant Chaplain in and for the School, and may only appoint a person as an Assistant Chaplain in the School if the licence is granted. The licence shall provide that it will cease upon the Assistant Chaplain ceasing to be a member of the staff of the School.

(2) If at any time and for any reason, an Assistant Chaplain in a Diocesan School ceases to hold the licence, they will cease to be entitled to act as Assistant Chaplain of the School, and must not thereafter hold himself or herself out as having this title. This will not of itself have the effect of removing the person from being a member of the staff of the School.

(3) An Assistant Chaplain in a Diocesan School –
   (a) may be an ordained or a lay person,
   (b) must hold, or be in the process of obtaining, a theological qualification that is commensurate with the functions they are to perform, and,
   (c) should, wherever possible, also hold an appropriate educational qualification.

(4) A person must not be given the title of Assistant Chaplain in a Diocesan School unless the requirements of this clause have been satisfied.

8. Chaplaincy in Diocesan Schools that are not Extra-Parochial

(1) Subject to this clause, in the case of a Diocesan School which is not extra-parochial, the Rector of the Parish in which the School is situated or, if situated in part, the Rector of the Parish in which it is predominantly situated, is the Chaplain of the School.

(2) The Archbishop may, on application from such Rector and with the approval of the School Council of the School, license another person –
   (a) as the Chaplain in place of the Rector, or
   (b) as an Assistant Chaplain to assist the Rector in his duties as Chaplain, and

if that licence is granted, the School Council may appoint the person as a Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain in accordance with the terms of the licence.
In the case of a person licensed under clause 8(2) –
(a) the Head of the School may temporarily suspend the person from duties, but thereupon must immediately notify the Archbishop the Rector and the School Council of such action, and
(b) the School Council may dismiss the person as a member of the staff of the School, in consultation with the Rector and the Archbishop.

9. School Ministry Plans for Diocesan Schools
The strategic planning process of each Diocesan School should incorporate a ministry plan which includes –
(a) the delivery of Christian Education,
(b) the delivery of Biblical Studies to all years of the School,
(c) strategies for providing pastoral care to staff and students, and
(d) strategies for presenting the gospel to the school community.

10. Chaplains of Anglican Schools
(1) The Archbishop may license a person to be a Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain of an Anglican School on application of such School.
(2) No member of clergy of the Anglican Church of Australia other than the Rector of any Parish in which an Anglican School is situated, or predominantly situated, is to act as Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain in any Anglican School unless licensed as Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain of such School by the Archbishop.
(3) If an Anglican School is situated, or predominantly situated, in a Parish and the Archbishop licenses a person other than the Rector of the Parish to be a Chaplain of the School, the right of the Rector to act as Chaplain ceases while that person is so licensed.
(4) A licence for a member of clergy who is proposed to be a Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain of an Anglican School must provide that it will cease upon the Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain’s ceasing to be a member of the staff of the School.

11. Chapels
(1) The Archbishop may license any building or part of a building as a Chapel in or for any School on application from its School Council.
(2) The safe custody of all records and Registers of Chapel services for a Diocesan School shall be the responsibility of the Chaplain.

12. Interaction with other ordinances
Notwithstanding the provisions of any other ordinance, the terms of this Ordinance prevail over the terms of any other ordinance to the extent of any inconsistency.

13. Transition
(1) All persons who, immediately before this Ordinance commences, hold the position of Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain in a Diocesan School which is extra-parochial are deemed to comply with clauses 6 and 7 to the extent they are applicable to the Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain in that School.
(2) Any Diocesan School which was declared extra-parochial under the School Chapels and Chaplains Ordinance 1975 shall be deemed to have been declared extra-parochial under the provisions of the Extra-Parochial Ordinance 1918.
(3) Any reference to the School Chapels and Chaplains Ordinance 1975 in any ordinance is to be taken to be a reference to the Anglican Schools Ministry Ordinance 2015 unless the context otherwise requires.

14. Repeal
The School Chapels and Chaplains Ordinance 1975 is repealed without affecting the validity of any action that has been taken under the terms of that ordinance.

15. Commencement
This Ordinance commences on 1 January 2016.
I Certify that the Ordinance as printed is in accordance with the Ordinance as reported.

P COLGAN
Chair of Committees

I Certify that this Ordinance was passed by the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney on 2015.

Secretary of Synod

I Assent to this Ordinance.

Archbishop of Sydney

/ /2015